الفَصْلُ الأَوَّلُ :إِثْبَاتُ ابْنِ حَزْمٍ لِأَسْمَاءِ اللهِ تَعَالَى وَمَعَانِيهَا الَّتِي يُطْلِقُ عَلَيْهَا مُخَالِفُهُ اسْمَ ٱلصِّفَاتِ

قَالَ مُحَمَّدُ بنُ إِبْرَاهِيمَ الرَّيْحَان الظَّاهِرِيُّ :

تَكَرَّرَ بَيَانُ هٰذِهِ ٱلْمَسْأَلَةِ، وَلٰكِنِّي أَجِدُ مَنْ لَمْ يَقْرَأْ كَلَامِي ٱلسَّابِقَ، فَأُعِيدُ ٱلْكَلَامَ مَرَّةً أُخْرَى، وَسَأَخْتَصِرُ ٱلْمَسْأَلَةَ هُنَا، وَأُبَيِّنُ بُطْلَانَ نِسْبَةِ أَبِي مُحَمَّدٍ إِلَى ٱلتَّجَهُّمِ، وَأُبَيِّنُ مِنْ كَلَامِ أَبِي مُحَمَّدٍ خَطَأَ مَنْ ظَنَّ ذٰلِكَ فَحَكَاهُ عَنْهُ، وَسَيَكُونُ ذٰلِكَ بِعِبَارَةٍ وَجِيزَةٍ إِنْ شَاءَ ٱللَّهُ تَعَالَى.

فَقَدْ ذَكَرْتُ أَكْثَرَ مِنْ مَرَّةٍ وَلِأَكْثَرَ مِنْ أَخٍ بِأَنَّ ٱلِٱخْتِلَافَ بَيْنَ ابْنِ حَزْمٍ وَابْنِ تَيْمِيَّةَ وَكُلِّ مَنْ تَأَخَّرَ مِمَّنْ وَافَقَ ابْنَ تَيْمِيَّةَ فِي مَسْأَلَةِ ٱلْأَسْمَاءِ وَمَا يُسَمَّى بِٱلصِّفَاتِ إِنَّمَا هُوَ ٱخْتِلَافٌ صُورِيٌّ غَيْرُ حَقِيقِيٍّ؛ لِأَنَّ ابْنَ حَزْمٍ وَابْنَ تَيْمِيَّةَ يَقُولَانِ بِوُجُوبِ إِثْبَاتِ أَسْمَاءِ اللهِ تَعَالَى ٱلثَّابِتَةِ بِٱلنَّصِّ ٱلصَّحِيحِ، كَمَا يَقُولَانِ بِوُجُوبِ إِثْبَاتِ مَعْنَى هٰذِهِ ٱلْأَسْمَاءِ، وَهٰذَا ٱلْمَعْنَى هُوَ ٱلَّذِي يُسَمِّيهِ مَنْ تَأَخَّرَ - وَمِنْهُمُ ابْنُ تَيْمِيَّةَ -: (ٱلصِّفَةَ).

وَأَقْصِدُ بِعَدَمِ ٱلِٱخْتِلَافِ وَأَنَّ ٱلِٱخْتِلَافَ صُورِيٌّ غَيْرُ حَقِيقِيٍّ: أَنَّ ابْنَ تَيْمِيَّةَ وَصَفَ ابْنَ حَزْمٍ بِأَنَّهُ جَهْمِيٌّ فِي بَابِ ٱلْأَسْمَاءِ وَٱلصِّفَاتِ، وَٱلْمَقْصُودُ مِنْ هٰذَا ٱلْبَابِ أَحَدُ أَمْرَيْنِ:

ٱلْأَوَّلُ: إِثْبَاتُ ٱلْأَسْمَاءِ ٱلثَّابِتَةِ بِٱلنَّصِّ ٱلصَّحِيحِ وَمَعَانِيهَا

Chapter One: Ibn Ḥazm’s Affirmation of the Names of Allah, the Most High, and Their Meanings — Which His Opponents Call “Attributes”

Statement by Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm al-Rayḥān al-Ẓāhirī:

This issue has been addressed repeatedly, but I still find people who have not read my previous statements, so I will restate the matter again. I will summarize the issue here and clarify the falsehood of attributing *tajahhum* (theological negation of divine attributes) to Abū Muḥammad (Ibn Ḥazm), and I will show from his own words the error of those who assumed that and narrated it from him. I will do this using concise language, God willing.

I have mentioned more than once and to more than one brother that the disagreement between Ibn Ḥazm and Ibn Taymiyyah — and all those who came after who agreed with Ibn Taymiyyah on the issue of the Names and what is referred to as "attributes" — is merely a superficial, not a real, disagreement. This is because both Ibn Ḥazm and Ibn Taymiyyah affirm the obligation of affirming the Names of Allah, the Most High, that are proven by authentic textual evidence, and they also affirm the meanings of these Names. These meanings are what later scholars — including Ibn Taymiyyah — refer to as “attributes.”

What I mean by saying there is no real disagreement and that the difference is merely superficial is that Ibn Taymiyyah described Ibn Ḥazm as being a *Jahmī* (follower of Jahm bin Ṣafwān, known for negating Allah’s attributes) in the matter of the Names and Attributes. What is meant by this issue are two things:

First: Affirming the Names proven by authentic texts and their meanings.

ٱلثَّانِي: إِثْبَاتُ ٱلْأَسْمَاءِ ٱلَّتِي لَمْ تَثْبُتْ بِٱلنَّصِّ وَمَعَانِيهَا.

فَهُمَا فِي ٱلْأَمْرِ ٱلْأَوَّلِ عَلَى ٱتِّفَاقٍ، وَلَا ٱخْتِلَافَ بَيْنَهُمَا فِيهِ أَصْلًا.

فَإِذَا قُلْتَ: هَلِ ٱلْأَسْمَاءُ ٱلثَّابِتَةُ بِٱلنَّصِّ ثَابِتَةٌ عِنْدَكُمْ؟

يَقُولُ ابْنُ حَزْمٍ: نَعَمْ، ثَابِتَةٌ. وَيَقُولُ ابْنُ تَيْمِيَّةَ: نَعَمْ، ثَابِتَةٌ. وَيَقُولُ ٱلْجَهْمِيُّ: لَا، لَيْسَتْ ثَابِتَةً.

وَإِذَا قُلْتَ: هَلْ مَعَانِي ٱلْأَسْمَاءِ ٱلثَّابِتَةِ بِٱلنَّصِّ ثَابِتَةٌ عِنْدَكُمْ؟

يَقُولُ ابْنُ حَزْمٍ: نَعَمْ، ثَابِتَةٌ، وَلَا يَجُوزُ تَغْيِيرُ ٱسْمِ ٱلْمَعَانِي إِلَى ٱسْمِ (صِفَةٍ) لِأَنَّ ٱللَّهَ لَمْ يَقُلْ ذٰلِكَ.

وَيَقُولُ ابْنُ تَيْمِيَّةَ: نَعَمْ، ثَابِتَةٌ، وَنُسَمِّيهَا (صِفَةً).

وَيَقُولُ ٱلْجَهْمِيُّ: لَا، لَيْسَتْ ثَابِتَةً.

فَفَارَقَتْ أَقْوَالُهُمَا قَوْلَ ٱلْجَهْمِيِّ فِي ٱلْأَسْمَاءِ وَفِي مَعَانِيهَا أَيْضًا، فَلَا يُمْكِنُ أَنْ يَكُونَ ابْنُ حَزْمٍ مُوَافِقًا لَهُمَا فِي ٱلْأَمْرَيْنِ ٱلْمَذْكُورَيْنِ، كَمَا كَانَ ابْنُ تَيْمِيَّةَ غَيْرَ مُوَافِقٍ لَهُمْ فِي ٱلْأَمْرَيْنِ.

فَلَا فَرْقَ بَيْنَ قَوْلِ ابْنِ حَزْمٍ وَابْنِ تَيْمِيَّةَ فِي إِثْبَاتِ ٱلْأَسْمَاءِ ٱلثَّابِتَةِ بِٱلنَّصِّ، وَإِثْبَاتِ ٱلْمَعَانِي مِنْهَا، وَإِنَّمَا وَقَعَ ٱلْخِلَافُ بَيْنَهُمَا فِي ٱلْإِبْقَاءِ عَلَى ٱسْمِ (مَعَانِي) كَمَا فِي لُغَةِ ٱلْعَرَبِ بِٱعْتِبَارِ كُلِّ ٱسْمٍ لَهُ مَعْنًى، وَهُوَ مَذْهَبُ ابْنِ حَزْمٍ، أَوْ نَقُومُ بِتَغْيِيرِ ٱلِٱسْمِ إِلَى (ٱلصِّفَةِ) كَمَا فَعَلَ كُلُّ مَنْ وَافَقَ ابْنَ تَيْمِيَّةَ، وَكَذٰلِكَ كُلُّ مَنْ وَافَقَهُ مِمَّنْ تَأَخَّرَ.

فَابْنُ تَيْمِيَّةَ وَمَنْ وَافَقَهُ أَطْلَقُوا ٱسْمَ (ٱلصِّفَاتِ) عَلَى مَعَانِي هٰذِهِ ٱلْأَسْمَاءِ، وَقَالَ ابْنُ حَزْمٍ: لَا يَجُوزُ إِطْلَاقُ هٰذَا ٱلِٱسْمِ؛ لِأَنَّ ٱللَّهَ تَعَالَى لَمْ يَقُلْهُ، وَلَا يَجُوزُ أَنْ نَحْكِيَ عَنْهُ أَمْرًا مُغَيَّبًا بِغَيْرِ نَصٍّ.

ثُمَّ وَصَفَ أَهْلَ ٱلسُّنَّةِ ٱلَّذِينَ أَطْلَقُوا هٰذِهِ ٱلْكَلِمَةَ بِأَنَّهُمْ عَلَى خَطَإٍ فِي هٰذَا ٱلْإِطْلَاقِ، وَأَنَّ ذٰلِكَ وَهْلَةٌ مِنْ فَاضِلٍ وَزَلَّةٌ مِنْ عَالِمٍ، وَأَنَّهُمْ لَوْ عَرَفُوا مَا تَدُلُّ عَلَيْهِ هٰذِهِ ٱلْكَلِمَةُ وَٱلْمَقْصُودَ بِهَا عِنْدَ أَهْلِ ٱلْكَلَامِ لَمَا ٱسْتَعْمَلُوهَا، وَوَصَفَ مَنْ عَرَفَ هٰذَا ٱلْمَعْنَى ٱلْكَلَامِيَّ ثُمَّ أَطْلَقَهُ عَلَى ٱللَّهِ تَعَالَى بِأَنَّهُ عَلَى ضَلَالٍ وَبِدْعَةٍ، وَأَنَّهُ أَلْحَدَ فِي أَسْمَاءِ ٱللَّهِ تَعَالَى.

Second: Affirming Names That Are Not Established by Text, and Their Meanings

So regarding the first matter, they (Ibn Ḥazm and Ibn Taymiyyah) are in complete agreement, with no difference whatsoever between them.

If you ask: *Are the names established by authentic text affirmed by you?*
Ibn Ḥazm says: Yes, they are affirmed.
Ibn Taymiyyah says: Yes, they are affirmed.
The Jahmī says: No, they are not affirmed.

If you ask: *Are the meanings of the names established by authentic text affirmed by you?*
Ibn Ḥazm says: Yes, they are affirmed, and it is not permissible to change the name "meanings" to "attributes" because Allah did not say that.
Ibn Taymiyyah says: Yes, they are affirmed, and we call them "attributes."
The Jahmī says: No, they are not affirmed.

So both their statements (Ibn Ḥazm's and Ibn Taymiyyah's) diverge from the Jahmī's view in both the names and their meanings. Therefore, it is impossible to claim that Ibn Ḥazm agreed with the Jahmīs in either of the two matters—just as Ibn Taymiyyah also did not agree with them in either.

Hence, there is no real difference between the views of Ibn Ḥazm and Ibn Taymiyyah in affirming the names established by authentic text, and in affirming the meanings of those names. The disagreement only lies in whether to retain the term "meanings" (as in the Arabic language, where every name has a meaning), which is Ibn Ḥazm's position, or to change the term to "attribute" (*ṣifah*), as did Ibn Taymiyyah and all who agreed with him, including later followers.

So Ibn Taymiyyah and his followers applied the term "attributes" to the meanings of these names, whereas Ibn Ḥazm said: it is not permissible to use that term because Allah, the Most High, did not say it, and one must not ascribe to Him something unseen without textual proof.

Then he (Ibn Ḥazm) described the Ahl al-Sunnah who used this term as being in a state of danger due to this usage, calling it a slip from the virtuous and an error from the common folk. He added that had they known what this term implies and what is intended by it in the terminology of the theologians (*ahl al-kalām*), they would not have used it. He described those who knew this theological meaning and still applied it to Allah, the Most High, as being upon misguidance and innovation, and that such a person has deviated in regard to the Names of Allah, the Most High.

وَلِذَٰلِكَ كَانَ ٱلْمُوَافِقُ لِقَوْلِ ٱبْنِ تَيْمِيَةَ إِذَا أَقَرَّ بِثُبُوتِ ٱلْأَسْمَاءِ وَثُبُوتِ ٱلْمَعَانِي، ثُمَّ أَطْلَقَ عَلَيْهَا لَفْظَ ٱلصِّفَاتِ: كَانَ قَوْلُهُ مِنَ ٱلْبِدْعَةِ وَٱلْخَطَإِ عِندَ ٱبْنِ حَزْمٍ، وَمُصِيبًا عِندَ ٱبْنِ تَيْمِيَةَ وَمَنْ وَافَقَهُ.

وَمَنْ تَوَقَّفَ وَقَالَ: هِيَ مَعَانِيَ أَسْمَاءِ ٱللَّهِ تَعَالَىٰ، وَلَا نُطْلِقُ عَلَيْهَا (ٱلصِّفَاتِ) وَهِيَ تَسْمِيَةٌ لَمْ تَثْبُتْ بِالنَّصِّ، وَلَمْ يُطْلِقْهَا ٱللَّهُ تَعَالَىٰ: فَهُوَ مُصِيبٌ عَلَى ٱلْحَقِّ عِندَ ٱبْنِ حَزْمٍ وَعِندَ ٱبْنِ تَيْمِيَةَ.

فَٱلِاخْتِلَافُ فِي تَسْمِيَةِ ٱلْمَعَانِي ٱلْمُسْتَفَادَةِ مِنْ أَسْمَاءِ ٱللَّهِ تَعَالَىٰ ٱلثَّابِتَةِ بِأَنَّهَا (صِفَاتٌ) هُوَ مَحَلُّ ٱلِاخْتِلَافِ ٱلْحَقِيقِيِّ، رَغْمَ أَنَّ ٱلْجَمِيعَ يُقِرُّ بِثُبُوتِ ٱلْمَعَانِي، بِخِلَافِ أَهْلِ ٱلْكَلَامِ كَٱلْجَهْمِيَّةِ وَغَيْرِهِمُ ٱلَّذِينَ عَرَّفُوا ٱلصِّفَةَ بِأَنَّهَا شَيْءٌ غَيْرُ ٱللَّهِ تَعَالَىٰ، وَأَنَّهَا مَحْمُولَةٌ فِي ذَاتِهِ، لَا تَقُومُ بِذَاتِهَا، وَأَنَّ إِثْبَاتَهَا يَقْتَضِي إِثْبَاتَ (قَدِيمٍ) مَعَ ٱللَّهِ، فَٱلْمُثْبِتُ لَهَا يُثْبِتُ أَكْثَرَ مِنْ قَدِيمٍ، وَأَنَّ هَٰذَا يُؤَدِّي إِلَى ٱلشِّرْكِ؛ لِأَنَّ ٱللَّهَ غَيْرُ صِفَتِهِ، وَكُلَّمَا زَادَتِ ٱلصِّفَاتُ زَادَ ٱلشِّرْكُ.

فَهَٰذَا ٱلْمَعْنَىٰ مِنَ ٱلصِّفَةِ لَيْسَ هُوَ ٱلْمَعْنَىٰ مِنْهَا فِي لُغَةِ ٱلْعَرَبِ؛ لِأَنَّ ٱلْعَرَبَ تَقْسِمُ ٱلْأَسْمَاءَ إِلَىٰ أَسْمَاءٍ لِلذَّوَاتِ (أَشْخَاصٍ)، وَأَسْمَاءٍ لِلْأَحْدَاثِ ٱلْمَنْسُوبَةِ إِلَىٰ تِلْكَ ٱلذَّوَاتِ، وَنِسْبَتُهَا لِلْأَحْدَاثِ تَكُونُ عَلَىٰ وُجُوهٍ: إِمَّا أَنَّهَا مِنْهَا، أَوْ فِيهَا، أَوْ عَلَيْهَا، أَوْ بِهَا، أَوْ لَهَا، وَنَحْوَ ذَٰلِكَ، فَلَا يُمْكِنُ لِحَدَثٍ أَنْ يَكُونَ مَوْجُودًا إِلَّا إِنْ كَانَ مِنْ ذَاتٍ، أَوْ فِي ذَاتٍ، أَوْ عَلَىٰ ذَاتٍ، أَوْ بِذَاتٍ، أَوْ لِذَاتٍ.

وَهَٰذِهِ ٱلْأَحْدَاثُ هِيَ ٱلْمَصَادِرُ فِي لُغَةِ ٱلْعَرَبِ، وَٱلْمَصَادِرُ: أَسْمَاءٌ دَالَّةٌ عَلَىٰ أَحْدَاثٍ لَمْ يُعَيَّنْ زَمَانُ حُدُوثِهَا، تَقُولُ: ٱلْقَتْلُ، وَٱلضَّرْبُ، وَٱلشَّتْمُ، وَٱلْأَكْلُ، وَٱلنَّوْمُ، فَكُلُّ هَٰذِهِ أَحْدَاثٌ لَا يُمْكِنُ أَنْ تَكُونَ مَوْجُودَةً وَمُدْرَكَةً إِلَّا مِنَ ٱلذَّوَاتِ، فَإِذَا عَيَّنْتَ زَمَانَ حُدُوثِهَا بِأَنَّهُ قَبْلَ زَمَانِ ٱلتَّكَلُّمِ بِٱلْكَلِمَةِ، قُلْتَ: قَتَلَ أَحْمَدُ ٱلْعَدُوَّ، وَإِذَا عَيَّنْتَهُ بِأَنَّهُ خِلَالَ زَمَانِ ٱلتَّكَلُّمِ بِٱلْكَلِمَةِ قُلْتَ: يَقْتُلُ، وَإِذَا عَيَّنْتَهُ بِأَنَّهُ سَيَقَعُ فِي زَمَانٍ بَعْدَ زَمَانِ ٱلتَّكَلُّمِ قُلْتَ: سَيَقْتُلُ، وَٱلْأَوَّلُ هُوَ ٱلْمَاضِي، وَٱلثَّانِي هُوَ ٱلْحَاضِرُ، وَٱلثَّالِثُ هُوَ ٱلْمُسْتَقْبَلُ.

وَأَسْمَاءُ ٱلْأَحْدَاثِ ٱلْمَنْسُوبَةِ إِلَىٰ ٱلذَّوَاتِ: هِيَ ٱلْمُسْنَدُ، وَٱلْمُخْبَرُ بِهِ، وَٱلْمَنْسُوبُ إِلَىٰ ٱلْمُخْبَرِ عَنْهُ.

فَإِذَا قُلتَ: أَحْمَدُ حَكِيمٌ، فَإِنَّكَ تَنْسِبُ إِلَيْهِ ٱلْحِكْمَةَ ٱلَّتِي لَمْ تَكُنْ فِيهِ إِلَّا بِسَبَبِ ظُهُورِهَا مِنْهُ فِي فِعْلٍ أَوْ قَوْلٍ، وَإِلَّا لَمْ يَكُنْ حَكِيمًا، فَالْحَدَثُ هَٰذَا يَحْتَاجُ إِلَىٰ فَاعِلٍ، وَلَا يُمْكِنُ أَنْ تَرَاهُ مِنْ غَيْرِ فَاعِلٍ.

Therefore, according to Ibn Hazm, anyone who agrees with Ibn Taymiyyah's view—acknowledging the confirmation of the Divine Names and their meanings—but then applies the label *"attributes"* (ṣifāt) to them, is committing an innovation (*bidʿah*) and an error. However, to Ibn Taymiyyah and those who follow him, such a statement is correct.

But whoever refrains from using the term and says, "These are the meanings of the Names of Allah the Exalted, and we do not call them *attributes* (ṣifāt), since this naming is not established by any textual evidence and Allah never used it," then that person is correct, according to both Ibn Hazm and Ibn Taymiyyah.

So, the real disagreement is over naming the derived meanings from Allah's confirmed Names as *attributes*. This is the core of the actual dispute, **even though both agree** on affirming the meanings themselves, unlike the theologians (ahl al-kalām) such as the Jahmiyyah and others.

These theologians define an *attribute* as something other than Allah, something that exists within His being but is not inherent to it, and claim that affirming such things means affirming something *eternal* besides Allah. Thus, they say, anyone who affirms attributes affirms multiple eternals—which leads to **polytheism**—since Allah is distinct from His attributes, and increasing attributes increases *partners* in divinity.

But this concept of "attribute" is not the same as its meaning in the **Arabic language**. The Arabs divide names into:

- **Names of entities (dhawāt)**, i.e., individual things or persons, and
- **Names of actions or events** associated with those entities.

The relationship of those events to the entity could be: *from it*, *in it*, *upon it*, *by it*, *for it*, etc. An event cannot exist unless it is tied to an entity in one of these ways.

These events in Arabic are called **verbal nouns (maṣādir)**—they denote actions without specifying their time. For example: *killing (al-qatl)*, *hitting (al-ḍarb)*, *insulting (al-shatm)*, *eating (al-akl)*, *sleeping (al-nawm)*—all of these are events that cannot exist or be perceived except by a doer.

If you specify the time of the action as before speaking, you say: *Ahmad killed the enemy.*
If it's during speaking: *Ahmad is killing the enemy.*
If it's after: *Ahmad will kill the enemy.*

These correspond to the **past**, **present**, and **future**.

And the **names of actions** linked to entities are the **predicates**—what is being described or reported. So if you say: *Ahmad is wise*, you are attributing *wisdom* to him, which only exists in him **because it appeared** in an action or statement. Without that, he would not be considered wise.

Thus, **every event** must have a **doer**—you cannot perceive an event without someone who performs it.

وَيُمْكِنُ هُنَا أَنْ تَقُولَ: صِفَةُ أَحْمَدَ أَنَّهُ حَكِيمٌ، وَٱلْمَعْنَىٰ: أَنَّهُ ٱلْمُسْنَدُ إِلَيْهِ، وَٱلْمُخْبَرُ بِهِ عَنْهُ، وَٱلْمَنْسُوبُ إِلَيْهِ هُوَ ٱلْحِكْمَةُ، أَيْ: هِيَ مِنْ بَعْضِ أَفْعَالِهِ أَوْ أَقْوَالِهِ.

وَعَلَىٰ هٰذَا يَقُولُ ٱلْعَرَبُ عَنْ هٰذِهِ ٱلْأَحْدَاثِ ٱلْمَنْسُوبَةِ إِلَىٰ ٱلْمُتَكَلِّمِ عَنْهُ وَٱلْمُخْبَرِ عَنْهُ بِأَنَّهَا صِفَتٌ لَهُ، أَيْ: مُتَّصِفٌ بِهَا وَيُوصَفُ بِهَا؛ لِأَنَّهَا مَنْسُوبَةٌ إِلَيْهِ، وَمُخْبَرٌ بِهَا عَنْهُ.

أَمَّا إِذَا قُلْنَا: ٱللَّهُ تَعَالَىٰ حَكِيمٌ، وَسَمِيعٌ، وَبَصِيرٌ، فَٱلْهٰذِهِ أَسْمَاءٌ للهِ تَعَالَىٰ، وَلَا تَدُلُّ عَلَىٰ غَيْرِهِ، وَكُلُّ ٱسْمٍ مِنْهَا فَلَهُ مَعْنَىٰ مَا، وَهٰذَا ٱلْمَعْنَىٰ لَا يُدْرِكُهُ ٱلْعَرَبُ وَغَيْرُهُمْ كُلَّ مَعْنَاهُ، وَلٰكِنَّ يُدْرِكُونَ ٱلْقَدَرَ ٱلْمُشْتَرَكَ فِي ٱللُّغَةِ ٱلْعَرَبِيَّةِ ٱلَّذِي يُمْكِنُ إِطْلَاقُهُ عَلَىٰ ٱللهِ تَعَالَىٰ دُونَ تَمْثِيلٍ وَلَا تَشْبِيهٍ.

فَإِذَا قُلْتَ: ٱللَّهُ سَمِيعٌ بَصِيرٌ، فَيَقْتَضِي هٰذَا فِي كَلَامِ ٱلْعَرَبِ أَنَّهُ تَعَالَىٰ يَسْمَعُ وَيُبْصِرُ، فَإِذَا دَخَلْتَ فِي ٱلْكَيْفِيَّةِ فَقُلْتَ: كَيْفَ يَسْمَعُ؟ وَبِمَا يَسْمَعُ؟ وَبِأَيِّ وَسِيلَةٍ يَتَحَقَّقُ ٱلسَّمْعُ؟ فَكُلُّ هٰذِهِ كَيْفِيَّاتٌ يَحْرُمُ ٱلسُّؤَالُ عَنْهَا؛ لِأَنَّ ٱللَّهَ تَعَالَىٰ لَمْ يُخْبِرْنَا بِهَا، وَأَمَرَنَا بِٱلْإِيمَٰنِ بِهِ وَبِمَآ أَخْبَرَنَا بِهِ فَقَطْ، وَنَهَانَا عَنْ ٱلزِّيَادَةِ عَمَّآ أَخْبَرَنَا بِهِ.

فَإِذَا أَخْبَرَ أَحَدٌ عَنْ ٱللهِ تَعَالَىٰ وَقَالَ: هٰذِهِ صِفَتُ ٱللَّهِ تَعَالَىٰ، فَيُقَالُ لَهُ: مَاذَا تُرِيدُ مِنْ كَلِمَةِ (صِفَتٍ) هَلْ تُرِيدُ بِهَا مَعْنَىٰ ٱلصِّفَةِ فِي كَلَامِ ٱلْعَرَبِ؟ أَمْ تُرِيدُ بِهَا مَعْنَىٰ ٱلصِّفَةِ فِي كَلَامِ أَهْلِ ٱلْكَلَامِ وَٱلْجَهْمِيَّةِ؟ وَبِمُوَافَقَةِ ٱلْجَوَابِ يَكُونُ ٱلْإِثْبَتُ أَوِ ٱلْإِبْطَالُ.

فَلَمَّا وَجَدَ ٱبْنُ حَزْمٍ بَعْضَ ٱلْمُسْلِمِينَ يَقُولُونَ: (سَمِيعٌ بِصِفَةِ ٱلسَّمْعِ) تَبَادَرَ إِلَىٰ ذِهْنِهِ مَا تَقَدَّمَ ذِكْرُهُ مِنْ كَيْفِيَّةٍ؛ لِأَنَّ حَرْفَ ٱلْبَاءِ لَا يَدْخُلُ فِي ٱلْكَلَامِ إِلَّا لِلدَّلَالَةِ عَلَىٰ ٱلِاتِّصَالِ، أَيْ أَنَّ ٱللَّهَ تَعَالَىٰ لَمْ يَكُنْ سَمِيعًا إِلَّا بِٱتِّصَالِهِ بِشَيْءٍ يَتَحَقَّقُ بِهِ ٱلسَّمْعُ، فَتَوَقَّفَ عَنْ هٰذَا ٱلْإِطْلَاقِ؛ لِأَنَّ ٱللَّهَ تَعَالَىٰ لَمْ يُخْبِرْنَا بِهِ.

فَإِذَا أَرَدْتَ إِثْبَاتَ أَنَّهُ تَعَالَى يَسْمَعُ فَيَكْفِي أَنْ تَقُولَ: اللهُ هُوَ السَّمِيعُ، وَهُوَ يَسْمَعُ كَمَا أَخْبَرَ تَعَالَى فِي نَصِّ الْقُرْآنِ، وَلَسْتَ مُحْتَاجًا إِلَى إِضَافَةِ (بِصِفَةِ السَّمْعِ) لِيَتَحَقَّقَ السَّمَاعُ، فَهِيَ زِيَادَةٌ زَادَهَا أَهْلُ الْكَلَامِ لِإِلْزَامِ الْمُثْبِتِ لِمَعَانِي أَسْمَاءِ اللهِ تَعَالَى مِمَّنْ يُطْلِقُ عَلَيْهَا اسْمَ (الْصِّفَاتِ) بِأَنَّ اللهَ تَعَالَى مُرَكَّبٌ مِنْ ذَاتٍ وَصِفَةٍ، وَأَنَّ الصِّفَةَ لَيْسَتْ هِيَ اللهَ تَعَالَى.

You can say here: “It is a *description* of Ahmad that he is wise,” meaning that this is what is predicated of him, informed about him, and attributed to him—that is, the wisdom stems from some of his actions or statements.

Based on this, the Arabs refer to such events attributed to the subject of speech as his **attributes (ṣifāt)**, meaning that he is characterized by them, and described through them, because they are linked to him and are reported about him.

However, when we say: *Allah the Exalted is Wise, Hearing, and Seeing*, these are **Names of Allah**, and they do not refer to anything other than Him. Each Name has a specific meaning, though humans—Arabs and non-Arabs alike—do not fully comprehend all of its depth. What they do grasp is the **shared linguistic meaning** in Arabic that can be applied to Allah *without analogy or resemblance*.

So when you say: *Allah is All-Hearing, All-Seeing*, it implies in the Arabic language that Allah hears and sees. But if you begin to delve into the *how*—asking: *How does He hear? With what does He hear? By what means is hearing realized?*—then all such questions about modality (*kayfiyyah*) are **forbidden** to ask. That is because Allah has not informed us about them. He has commanded us to **believe** in Him and what He has informed us about, and **forbidden** us from going beyond what He revealed.

So if someone reports about Allah and says: “This is an attribute (*ṣifah*) of Allah,” they must be asked: *What do you mean by the word "attribute"?* Do you mean the linguistic meaning in **Arabic usage**, or the technical meaning as used by **theologians (ahl al-kalām)** and **the Jahmiyyah**?

The acceptance or rejection of such a statement depends on the answer.

When Ibn Hazm heard some Muslims say: *He is Hearing by the attribute of hearing*, it immediately triggered in his mind the earlier-mentioned issue of **modality**. That is because the Arabic particle *bi-* (“by”) typically implies **connection or attachment**, which would suggest that Allah is only Hearing **by being connected to something** through which hearing occurs. So Ibn Hazm refrained from using this phrasing, because Allah never told us anything like that.

If you want to affirm that Allah hears, then it is enough to say: *Allah is the All-Hearing, and He hears*, just as He informed us in the Qur’an. You are not required to say *"by the attribute of hearing”* to prove that He hears. That addition was introduced by the **theologians (ahl al-kalām)** in their attempts to force those who affirm the meanings of Allah’s Names and call them **attributes**, into a philosophical framework where Allah is supposedly composed of an essence and attributes—suggesting that the attribute is **not** Allah Himself.

فَكَأَنَّ ابْنَ حَزْمٍ يَقُولُ: إِذَا أَخْبَرَ اللهُ تَعَالَى بِأَنَّ لَهُ صِفَاتٍ قُلْنَا: صِفَاتٌ لَيْسَ كَمِثْلِهَا شَيْءٌ، وَهِيَ لَا تَرْجِعُ إِلَّا إِلَى اللهِ تَعَالَى، وَإِنْ لَمْ يُثْبِتْ سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى ذُلِكَ: تَوَقَّفْنَا وَأَمْسَكْنَا عَنْ قَوْلِهَا وَنِسْبَتِهَا إِلَى اللهِ تَعَالَى؛ لِأَنَّهَا مِنَ الْإِلْحَادِ بِأَسْمَائِهِ.

أَمَّا مَسْأَلَةُ: تَسْوِيَةِ ابْنِ حَزْمٍ بَيْنَ أَسْمَاءِ اللهِ تَعَالَى فِي الْمَعْنَى، فَإِنَّهُ اسْتَعْمَلَ ذُلِكَ فِي أَمْرَيْنِ،وَهُمَا

.الْأَمْرُ الْأَوَّلُ: أَنَّ الْمُسَمَّى بِهَذِهِ الْأَسْمَاءِ وَاحِدٌ

فَلَا فَرْقَ حِينَئِذٍ بَيْنَ قَوْلِكَ: السَّمِيعُ، وَالْبَصِيرُ، وَالرَّحِيمُ، وَالْحَكِيمُ، وَالْعَزِيزُ، وَاللهُ، فَكُلُّهَا أَسْمَاءٌ تَدُلُّ عَلَى اللهِ تَعَالَى وَلَا تَدُلُّ عَلَى غَيْرِهِ، فَتُحِيطُ هَذِهِ الْمَسْأَلَةُ بِأَنَّ اللهَ وَاحِدٌ وَلَهُ أَسْمَاءٌ كَثِيرَةٌ، فَالْقَدِيرُ وَالْغَفُورُ وَالْوَدُودُ وَاللطِيفُ وَالْخَبِيرُ كُلُّهَا أَسْمَاءٌ مَتَى مَا أُطْلِقَتْ: دَلَّتْ عَلَى اللهِ تَعَالَى، وَلَمْ تَدُلَّ عَلَى غَيْرِهِ.

وَأَخَذَ ابْنُ تَيْمِيَّةَ وَغَيْرُهُ هَذِهِ التَّسْوِيَةَ وَطَبَّقُوهَا عَلَى الْأَمْرِ الثَّانِي، وَقَالُوا: ابْنُ حَزْمٍ يَقُولُ بِأَنَّ هَذِهِ الْأَسْمَاءَ كُلَّهَا بِمَعْنًى وَاحِدٍ.

وَهَذَا مِنْ أَقْبَحِ الْخَطَأِ فِي النَّقْلِ، فَحَسْبَ التَّسْوِيَةِ لَيْسَتْ بِمَعْنَى التَّسْوِيَةِ الثَّانِيَةِ الَّتِي سَأَذْكُرُهَا الْآنَ، وَإِنَّمَا هِيَ تَسْوِيَةٌ بَيْنَ الْأَسْمَاءِ فِي الدَّلَالَةِ عَلَى مُسَمًّى وَاحِدٍ سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى.

الْأَمْرُ الثَّانِي: أَنَّ مِنَ الْأَسْمَاءِ مَا تَكُونُ رَاجِعَةً إِلَى مَعْنَى الْعَلِيمِ

فَلَا فَرْقَ بَيْنَ مَعْنَى السَّمِيعِ وَالْبَصِيرِ عِندَهُ، وَذَكَرَ أَنَّهُمَا يَرْجِعَانِ فِي الْحَقِيقَةِ إِلَى اسْمِ الْعَلِيمِ؛ لِأَنَّ اللهَ تَعَالَى يَسْمَعُ وَيُبْصِرُ مَا أَوْجَدَهُ بَعْدَ أَنْ كَانَ مَعْدُومًا، وَقَدْ كَانَ اللهُ تَعَالَى وَلَا شَيْءَ مَعَهُ، ثُمَّ خَلَقَ الْقَلَمَ فَأَمَرَهُ أَنْ يَكْتُبَ مَا يَكُونُ إِلَى يَوْمِ الْقِيَامَةِ، فَكَتَبَ كُلَّ شَيْءٍ أَمَرَهُ بِهِ تَعَالَى.

وَمِنْ تِلْكَ الْأَشْيَاءِ الَّتِي كَتَبَهَا: أَنَّ فُلَانًا سَيَصْدُرُ عَنْهُ مَا يُسْمَعُ، وَأَنَّ كَذَا سَيَكُونُ فِي زَمَنِ كَذَا مُبْصَرًا، فَاللهُ تَعَالَى لَا يَسْمَعُ الْمَسْمُوعَ وَلَا يُبْصِرُ الْمُبْصَرَ وَهُوَ مَعْدُومٌ، وَلَكِنَّهُ يَسْمَعُهُ وَيُبْصِرُهُ بَعْدَ أَنْ يُوجِدَهُ مِنَ الْعَدَمِ، وَكُلُّ مَا كَانَ مَعْدُومًا، ثُمَّ أَوْجَدَهُ اللهُ تَعَالَى فَهُوَ عَلِيمٌ بِهِ وَبِمَا سَيَقَعُ مِنْهُ، سَوَاءٌ كَانَ مَا سَيَقَعُ مِنْهُ مَسْمُوعًا أَوْ مُبْصَرًا، فَلِذُلِكَ كَانَ كُلُّ سَمِيعٍ وَبَصِيرٍ يَسْبِقُهُمَا الْعِلْمُ، فَعِلْمُ اللهِ تَعَالَى سَابِقٌ لَهُمَا؛ لِأَنَّهُ عَلِمَ ذُلِكَ قَبْلَ أَنْ يَصْدُرَ مِنَ الْمَسْمُوعِ وَالْمُبْصَرِ.

It is as if Ibn Hazm is saying: *If Allah the Exalted informs us that He has attributes (ṣifāt), we affirm them by saying: "Attributes that are like nothing else,"* and these attributes refer only to Allah the Exalted. But if He has not affirmed something, then we withhold and refrain from stating or attributing it to Him—because doing so would be *deviating* in regard to His Names (*ilhād fī asmā'ihi*).

As for the issue of **Ibn Hazm treating all of Allah's Names equally in meaning**, he did so in regard to **two matters**:

First: That the One referred to by these Names is a **single entity**. So, there is no difference when you say: *The All-Hearing (al-Samī'), the All-Seeing (al-Baṣīr), the Most Merciful (al-Raḥīm), the Wise (al-Ḥakīm), the Almighty (al-'Azīz), or Allah*—all of these are Names that refer to **Allah alone**, and not to anything else. This relates to the fact that **Allah is one** and has **many Names**: *al-Qadīr (All-Powerful), al-Ghafūr (Forgiving), al-Wadūd (Loving), al-Laṭīf (Subtle), al-Khabīr (All-Aware)* —all of them, when mentioned, indicate **only Allah** and none other.

Ibn Taymiyyah and others took this equality and applied it to a **second matter**, saying that Ibn Hazm believed that **all of these Names have the same meaning**. But this is one of the **grossest errors in reporting**, because this kind of equality is **not** the same as the second meaning (which will now be explained). Rather, the equality Ibn Hazm intended is: *All of the Names equally indicate a single Named Entity—Allah the Exalted.*

The second matter: That **some Names revert to the same core meaning**, like the meaning of *al-'Alīm (the All-Knowing)*.

So, in Ibn Hazm's view, there is no difference between the meanings of *al-Samī' (the Hearing)* and *al-Baṣīr (the Seeing)*, because both return in essence to the meaning of *knowledge (ʿilm)*. He explained that Allah hears and sees what He brings into existence **after it was previously nonexistent**. Allah existed alone, and then He created the Pen and commanded it to write what would occur until the Day of Resurrection. The Pen wrote everything He commanded.

Among those things that were written is that a certain person would say something audible, or that a certain thing would be seen at a certain time. Thus, Allah does not hear what is yet nonexistent, nor see what is nonexistent. Rather, He hears and sees it **after** He brings it into being. And everything that was nonexistent and then brought into being by Allah—He already had **knowledge** of it and of what would proceed from it—whether it would later be something heard or something seen.

Therefore, *hearing and seeing* are both derived from **knowledge**, and Allah's knowledge precedes them both—because He knew about these things before anything audible or visible came into existence.

وَكَذَٰلِكَ: فَإِنَّهُ تَعَالَى يَعْلَمُ مَا يَكُونُ وَسَيَكُونُ، وَمَا لَمْ يَكُنْ لَوْ كَانَ كَيْفَ يَكُونُ، فَهُوَ تَعَالَى لَا يَخْفَى عَلَيْهِ شَيْءٌ، وَيَعْلَمُ السِّرَّ وَأَخْفَى، وَيَعْلَمُ مَا نُعْلِنُ وَمَا نَبْطِنُ؛ لِأَنَّ كُلَّ مَا سَيَقَعُ فَهُوَ رَاجِعٌ إِلَى مَا أَخْبَرَ بِهِ الْقَلَمُ وَأَمَرَ أَنْ يَكُونَ مَكْتُوبًا.

فَإِذَا قُلْنَا: السَّمِيعُ، فَيَعْنِي ذَٰلِكَ: ثُبُوتَ عِلْمِ اللهِ تَعَالَى السَّابِقِ بِأَنَّ ذَٰلِكَ الشَّيْءَ سَيَصْدُرُ عَنْهُ مَا يُسْمَعُ، وَهَكَذَا الْبَصِيرُ، وَمِنْ هَذَا الْوَجْهِ قَالَ ابْنُ حَزْمٍ بِالتَّسْوِيَةِ بَيْنَ السَّمِيعِ وَالْبَصِيرِ، وَأَنَّهُمَا يَرْجِعَانِ إِلَى الْعَلِيمِ.

فَمَنْ خَالَفَهُ فِي هَذَا وَقَالَ: (السَّمِيعُ مِنَ اللهِ تَعَالَى لَا يَرْجِعُ إِلَى عِلْمِ اللهِ السَّابِقِ): فَقَدْ قَالَ قَوْلًا عَظِيمًا لَا جَازَ قَوْلُهُ، وَكَذَٰلِكَ الْقَوْلُ فِي الْبَصِيرِ.

فَإِذَا قَالَ لَكَ إِنسَانٌ: (قَالَتِ الْجَهْمِيَّةُ بِإِبْطَالِ أَسْمَاءِ اللهِ تَعَالَى الثَّابِتَةِ بِالنُّصُوصِ، وَقَالُوا بِإِبْطَالِ مَعْنَاهَا أَيْضًا).

ثُمَّ لَقِيتَ غَيْرَهُ فَقَالَ لَكَ: (هَلْ سَمِعْتَ مَا قَالَتْهُ الْجَهْمِيَّةُ فِي أَسْمَاءِ اللهِ الثَّابِتَةِ بِالنَّصِّ وَمَعَانِيهَا؟).

فَتُجِيبُهُ: قَدْ عَلِمْتُ، وَيُمْكِنُ أَنْ تَقُولَ: قَدْ سَمِعْتُ، فَأَرَدْتَ بِالْعِلْمِ: عِلْمَكَ السَّابِقَ، وَبِالسَّمْعِ: الْخَبَرَ الَّذِي نُقِلَ إِلَيْكَ.

وَكَذَلِكَ إِذَا كُنْتَ تَعْلَمُ هَذَا بِسَمَاعِ قَوْلِهِمْ، فَسَأَلَكَ سَائِلٌ، فَقَالَ: (هَلْ تَعْلَمُ مَا قَالَتِ الْجَهْمِيَّةُ؟)

فَتُجِيبُ: نَعَمْ، قَدْ سَمِعْتُهُ، وَقَدْ عَلِمْتُهُ، فَسَمْعُكَ: سَمِعْتَهُ حِينَ نَطَقَ بِهِ مَنْ قَالَهُ، وَعِلْمُكَ بِهِ كَمَا تَقَدَّمَ إِنْ كَانَ هَذَا الْمَعْنَى ثَابِتًا قَبْلَ ذَلِكَ.

وَلِذَلِكَ لَمْ يَرَ ابْنُ حَزْمٍ فَرْقًا بَيْنَ ذَلِكَ، فَمَا يَسْمَعُهُ اللهُ تَعَالَى قَدْ كَانَ مَعْلُومًا عِنْدَهُ قَبْلَ أَنْ يَصْدُرَ مِنَ الْمَسْمُوعِ وَالْمُبْصَرِ، وَهَذَا أَيْضًا جَائِزٌ فِي لُغَةِ الْعَرَبِ، فَيَجُوزُ اسْتِعْمَالُ سَمِعَ بِمَعْنَى عَلِمَ إِنْ كَانَ الْعِلْمُ سَابِقًا، وَكَذَلِكَ يَجُوزُ اسْتِعْمَالُ عَلِمَ بِمَعْنَى سَمِعَ.

Likewise, Allah the Exalted **knows what is, what will be, and what never was—if it were to be, how it would be**. Nothing is hidden from Him. He knows the secret and what is more hidden. He knows what we make public and what we conceal, because **everything that will happen** goes back to what the Pen was informed of and commanded to write.

So when we say: *"The All-Hearing (al-Samīʿ)"*, it means: the affirmation of Allah's prior knowledge that something will be produced from a person that can be heard. And likewise is *"The All-Seeing (al-Baṣīr)"*. From this perspective, Ibn Hazm said there is **equality between al-Samīʿ and al-Baṣīr**, and that **both return to al-ʿAlīm (The All-Knowing)**.

So whoever opposes him in this and says: *"Allah's hearing does not return to His prior knowledge"*—has said something grave and unacceptable. And the same applies to the one who says this about *al-Baṣīr* (The All-Seeing).

Now, if someone tells you: *"The Jahmiyyah denied the Names of Allah affirmed in the texts, and they also denied their meanings,"* and then you meet someone else who says: *"Have you heard what the Jahmiyyah said about the Names of Allah and their meanings?"*

You may answer: *"I knew,"* or you may say: *"I heard."* In the first case, you mean your **prior knowledge**, and in the second, you mean the **report** that reached you.

Likewise, if you came to know this **by hearing their words**, and someone asks you: *"Do you know what the Jahmiyyah said?"*—you can reply: *"Yes, I heard it,"* or *"I knew it."* Your *hearing* refers to when you heard it being spoken, and your *knowledge* refers to what had already become established for you earlier.

That is why Ibn Hazm **saw no difference** in such cases: **What Allah hears, He already knew before it was spoken or seen**. This is also acceptable in Arabic language usage: it is permissible to use *"heard"* (*samiʿa*) in the sense of *"knew"* (*ʿalima*)—if the knowledge was prior. And likewise, *ʿalima* can be used in the sense of *samiʿa*.

وَبَعْدَ هَذَا التَّفْصِيلِ الَّذِي أَضَفْتُهُ بَعْدَ نَشْرِ الْمَقَالَةِ حِينَ رَأَيْتُ السُّؤَالَ عَنْهُ وَعَدَمَ وُضُوحِ بَعْضِ جُزْئِيَّاتِهِ، فَلْنَأْتِ الْآنَ إِلَى نُصُوصِ ابْنِ حَزْمٍ، فَقَدْ قَالَ رَحِمَهُ اللهُ وَهُوَ يَتَحَدَّثُ عَنْ أَسْمَاءِ اللهِ تَعَالَى وَمَعَانِيهَا:

النَّصُّ الْأَوَّلُ: مِنْ كِتَابِ (الْمُحَلَّى).

قَالَ: (وَأَنَّ لَهُ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ تِسْعَةً وَتِسْعِينَ اسْمًا، مِائَةً غَيْرَ وَاحِدٍ، وَهِيَ أَسْمَاؤُهُ الْحُسْنَى، مَنْ زَادَ شَيْئًا مِنْ عِنْدِ نَفْسِهِ فَقَدْ أَلْحَدَ فِي أَسْمَائِهِ، وَهِيَ الْأَسْمَاءُ الْمَذْكُورَةُ فِي الْقُرْآنِ وَالسُّنَّةِ).

فَفِي هَذَا النَّصِّ: أَثْبَتَ ابْنُ حَزْمٍ كُلَّ اسْمٍ ثَبَتَ فِي النُّصُوصِ الشَّرْعِيَّةِ، وَهَذَا هُوَ فِعْلُ ابْنِ تَيْمِيَةَ نَفْسِهِ، وَهُوَ الَّذِي لَا تَقُولُ بِهِ الْجَهْمِيَّةُ أَصْلًا، فَهَذَا تَوَافُقٌ بَيْنَ ابْنِ حَزْمٍ وَابْنِ تَيْمِيَةَ فِي إِثْبَاتِ الْأَسْمَاءِ الْمَنْصُوصِ عَلَيْهَا.

النَّصُّ الثَّانِي: مِنْ (كِتَابِ الْفَصْلِ).

قَالَ: (فَيَجُوزُ أَنْ يُقَالَ: عَالِمُ الْخَفِيَّاتِ، عَالِمٌ بِكُلِّ شَيْءٍ، عَالِمُ الْغَيْبِ وَالشَّهَادَةِ، غَالِبٌ عَلَى أَمْرِهِ، غَالِبٌ عَلَى كُلِّ مَنْ طَغَى، وَنَحْوُ هَذَا، الْقَادِرُ عَلَى مَا يَشَاءُ، الْقَاهِرُ لِلْمُلُوكِ، وَارِثُ الْأَرْضِ وَمَنْ عَلَيْهَا، الْمُعْطِي لِكُلِّ مَا بِأَيْدِينَا، الْوَاهِبُ لَنَا كُلَّ مَا عِنْدَنَا، الْمُنْعِمُ عَلَى خَلْقِهِ، الْمُحْسِنُ إِلَى أَوْلِيَائِهِ، الْحَاكِمُ بِالْحَقِّ، الْمُبْدِي لِخَلْقِهِ، الْمُعِيدُ لَهُ، الْمُضِلُّ لِأَعْدَائِهِ، الْهَادِي لِأَوْلِيَائِهِ، الْعَدْلُ فِي حُكْمِهِ، الصَّادِقُ فِي قَوْلِهِ، الرَّاضِي عَمَّنْ أَطَاعَهُ، الْغَضْبَانُ عَلَى مَنْ عَصَاهُ، السَّاخِطُ عَلَى أَعْدَائِهِ، الْكَارِهُ لِمَا نَهَى عَنْهُ، بَدِيعُ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ، إِلَهُ الْخَلْقِ، مُحْيِي الْأَحْيَاءِ وَالْمَوْتَى، مُمِيتُ الْأَحْيَاءِ وَالْمَوْتَى، الْمُنْصِفُ مِمَّنْ ظَلَمَ، بَانِي الدُّنْيَا وَدَاحِيهَا وَمُسَوِّيهَا، وَنَحْوُ هَذَا، لِأَنَّ كُلَّ هَذَا إِخْبَارٌ عَنْ فِعْلِهِ تَعَالَى، وَهَذَا مُبَاحٌ لَنَا بِالْإِجْمَاعِ، وَهُوَ مِنْ تَعْظِيمِهِ تَعَالَى، وَمِنْ دُعَائِهِ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ، وَلَيْسَ لَنَا أَنْ نُسَمِّيَهُ إِلَّا بِنَصٍّ).

فَفِي هَذَا النَّصِّ: إِثْبَاتٌ لِمَعَانِي الْأَسْمَاءِ، وَنِسْبَتُهَا إِلَى اللهِ تَعَالَى، وَإِجَازَةُ الدُّعَاءِ بِهَا، فَـ"الْغَضْبَانُ" عَلَى مَنْ عَصَاهُ، وَ"السَّاخِطُ"، وَ"الْكَارِهُ"، وَغَيْرُ ذَلِكَ لَيْسَتْ مِنْ أَسْمَاءِ اللهِ تَعَالَى، وَإِنَّمَا أَخَذَهَا مِنْ مَعْنَى بَعْضِ أَسْمَاءِ اللهِ تَعَالَى الثَّابِتَةِ بِالنَّصِّ، فَلَمْ يَرَ حَرَجًا مِنَ الدُّعَاءِ بِمَعَانِي هَذِهِ الْأَسْمَاءِ.

After this detailed clarification that I provided following the publication of the article—when I noticed questions about it and the lack of clarity in some of its parts—let us now turn to the **statements of Ibn Ḥazm**. May Allah have mercy on him. He spoke regarding the **Names of Allah the Exalted and their meanings**:

First Text: From *al-Muḥallā*
He said:
"And that He, Mighty and Majestic, has ninety-nine names, one hundred minus one; these are His Beautiful Names. Whoever adds anything from himself has committed deviation (ilḥād) regarding His Names. These are the Names mentioned in the Qur'an and the Sunnah."

In this text, **Ibn Ḥazm affirms every Name that is established in the revealed texts**, and this is exactly what **Ibn Taymiyyah himself** did. This is something **the Jahmiyyah do not affirm at all**. Thus, there is agreement between Ibn Ḥazm and Ibn Taymiyyah on affirming the explicitly mentioned Names.

Second Text: From *al-Faṣl*
He said:
*"It is permissible to say: 'Knower of the unseen matters,' 'Knower of all things,' 'Knower of the seen and unseen,' 'Prevailing over His command,' 'Prevailing over all who transgress,' and similar such phrases—'Able to do whatever He wills,' 'Subduer of kings,' 'Inheritor of the earth and whoever is upon it,' 'Giver of everything we possess,' 'Bestower of all we have,' 'Granter of favor to His creation,' 'Doer of good to His allies,' 'Judge with truth,' 'Initiator of His creation,' 'Restorer of it,' 'Misguider of His enemies,' 'Guide of His allies,' 'Just in His rulings,' 'Truthful in His speech,' 'Pleased with those who obey Him,' 'Angry with those who disobey Him,' 'Displeased with His enemies,' 'Hating that which He has forbidden,' 'Originator of the heavens and the earth,' 'God of all creation,' 'Giver of life to the living and the dead,' 'Giver of death to the living and the dead,' 'One who gives justice to the oppressed,' 'Builder of the world, its spreader and its leveler,' and the like—because all of this is **informing about His actions**, and this is **permissible for us by consensus**. It is a form of **glorification of Him, Exalted is He**, and part of **calling upon Him**. However, we *may not name Him except with a revealed text (naṣṣ)."*

In this passage, there is **affirmation of the meanings of the Names**, attributing them to Allah the Exalted, and permission to **supplicate using those meanings**. Terms like *the Angry with those who disobey Him*, *the Displeased*, *the One who hates (evil)*, and others are **not among the formal Names of Allah**, but **are derived from the meanings of certain Names established in the texts**. Therefore, Ibn Ḥazm **did not see any objection to supplicating with the meanings of these Names**.

وَانْظُرْ إِلَى سَبَبِ ابْنِ حَزْمٍ فِي تَجْوِيزِ ذَلِكَ حِينَ قَالَ: (لِأَنَّ كُلَّ هَذَا إِخْبَارٌ عَنْ فِعْلِهِ تَعَالَى، وَهَذَا مُبَاحٌ لَنَا بِالْإِجْمَاعِ)، فَكُلُّ مَا أَخْبَرْتَ بِهِ عَنْ اللهِ تَعَالَى عَلَى أَنَّهُ مِنْ فِعْلِهِ: فَيَجُوزُ أَنْ تَدْعُوَ بِهِ وَتَنْطِقَ بِهِ وَتَنْسِبَهُ إِلَى اللهِ تَعَالَى.

وَهَذَا هُوَ نَفْسُ السَّبَبِ الَّذِي قَالَهُ عَنْ سُورَةِ الإِخْلَاصِ الَّتِي وَرَدَ ذِكْرُهَا فِي الْحَدِيثِ وَأَنَّهَا صِفَةُ الرَّحْمَنِ، فَذَكَرَ جَوَازَ ذَلِكَ لِأَنَّ الصِّفَةَ إِنَّمَا هِيَ الْخَبَرُ عَنِ الشَّيْءِ، فَهَذِهِ السُّورَةُ هِيَ خَبَرٌ عَنِ اللهِ تَعَالَى بِمَا هُوَ فِيهِ سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى عَلَى مَا جَاءَ فِي السُّورَةِ مِنْ مَعْنًى.

وَمِنْ هَذَا السَّبَبِ أَيْضًا: قَالَ فِي بَعْضِ نُسَخِ الْمُحَلَّى الَّتِي وَرَدَتْ بِرِوَايَةٍ غَيْرِ الرِّوَايَةِ الْمُتَدَاوَلَةِ بِأَيْدِينَا: (نَصِفُ اللهَ بِمَا وَصَفَ بِهِ نَفْسَهُ)، وَقَالَ فِي الرِّوَايَةِ الَّتِي بِأَيْدِينَا: (وَنُخْبِرُ عَنِ اللهِ بِمَا أَخْبَرَ بِهِ عَنْ نَفْسِهِ).

فَالْوَصْفُ وَالصِّفَةُ إِنْ كَانَا بِمَعْنَى الإِخْبَارِ وَالْخَبَرِ الْمَنْسُوبِ إِلَى الْمُخْبَرِ عَنْهُ: فَهُوَ إِطْلَاقٌ جَائِزٌ فِي كَلَامِ الْعَرَبِ، وَفِي حُكْمِ الشَّرِيعَةِ، بِخِلَافِ الصِّفَةِ الَّتِي يُقْصَدُ بِهَا الْمَعْنَى الْمَذْكُورُ عِنْدَ أَهْلِ الْكَلَامِ، وَهِيَ الَّتِي تَقَدَّمَ ذِكْرُ مَعْنَاهَا، فَهِيَ: الْمَحْمُولَةُ فِي الذَّاتِ، وَالَّتِي لَا تَقُومُ بِنَفْسِهَا، وَالَّتِي هِيَ غَيْرُ الذَّاتِ.

وَهَذَا الْإِثْبَاتُ لِمَعَانِي الْأَسْمَاءِ يُوَافِقُهُ عَلَيْهِ ابْنُ تَيْمِيَةَ أَيْضًا، أَعْنِي: أَنَّ كُلَّ اسْمٍ مِنْ أَسْمَاءِ اللهِ تَعَالَى، فَهُوَ يَدُلُّ عَلَى مَعْنًى مَا، وَهُوَ الَّذِي لَا يَقُولُ بِهِ الْجَهْمِيُّ، فَهُوَ يُبْطِلُ الْأَسْمَاءَ وَالْمَعَانِيَ مَعًا.

فَفِي جَمِيعِ مَا تَقَدَّمَ: رَدٌّ عَلَى مَنْ لَمْ يَتَفَحَّصْ مَذْهَبَ أَبِي مُحَمَّدٍ، فَنَسَبَهُ إِلَى التَّجْهِيمِ، فَهُوَ فِي هَذِهِ النُّصُوصِ وَفِي غَيْرِهَا قَدْ أَثْبَتَ أَسْمَاءَ اللهِ تَعَالَى، وَهَذَا بِخِلَافِ مَذْهَبِ الْجَهْمِيَّةِ الَّذِينَ قَالُوا بِبُطْلَانِهَا؛ لِأَنَّهَا تُوجِبُ التَّشْبِيهَ عِنْدَهُمْ.

فَمَنْ قَالَ: ابْنُ حَزْمٍ مُوَافِقٌ لِلْجَهْمِيَّةِ فِي إِبْطَالِ أَسْمَاءِ اللهِ تَعَالَى، الَّذِي هُوَ مَذْهَبُ الْجَهْمِيَّةِ: فَهُوَ مُخْطِئٌ، وَإِنْ كَانَ عَالِمًا بِقَوْلِ ابْنِ حَزْمٍ هَذَا وَكَرَّرَ خِلَافَهُ: فَهُوَ كَاذِبٌ.

وَفِي هَذِهِ النُّصُوصِ أَيْضًا: أَثْبَتَ ابْنُ حَزْمٍ مَعَانِيَ هَذِهِ الْأَسْمَاءِ، بِخِلَافِ الْجَهْمِيَّةِ الَّذِينَ أَبْطَلُوا الْأَسْمَاءَ وَمَعَانِيَهَا، فَكُلُّ مَا ذَكَرَهُ هُنَا إِنَّمَا هُوَ الْمَعْنَى مِنِ اسْمِ اللهِ تَعَالَى، وَلَيْسَ هُوَ الِاسْمَ نَفْسَهُ.

Look at Ibn Ḥazm's reasoning for allowing this, when he said:
"All of this is information about His action, the Exalted, and this is permitted for us by consensus. So, everything you report about Allah the Exalted as being from His actions—it is permissible to call upon Him with it, to speak it, and to attribute it to Allah the Exalted."

This is the **same reasoning** he mentioned regarding **Sūrat al-Ikhlāṣ**, which is referenced in the ḥadīth as being **a description of the Most Merciful (al-Raḥmān)**. He stated that this is permissible because an attribute is simply a **report about something**, and this Sūrah is a **report about Allah the Exalted**, about **what He truly is**, as expressed in its meanings.

And based on this same reasoning, in some versions of *al-Muḥallā* (transmitted through a different narration than the one widely circulated among us), he said:
"We describe Allah with what He has described Himself with."
And in the version we have:
"And you report about Allah what He has reported about Himself."

So, if **"description" and "attribute"** mean **reporting and information attributed to the One being described**, then such usage is valid in **Arabic language** and **in the judgment of the Sharīʿah**.
This is in contrast to the concept of "attributes" (ṣifāt) as defined by the **theologians (ahl al-kalām)**—which refers to **something inherent in the essence (dhāt), not self-subsisting, and different from the essence itself**.

This affirmation of the **meanings** of the Names is also something **Ibn Taymiyyah agrees with**—meaning: **every Name of Allah the Exalted indicates a meaning**.
And this is precisely what the **Jahmiyyah do not affirm**: they **negate both the Names and their meanings**.

So in all of what has been presented, there is a **refutation of those who did not properly examine the view of Abū Muḥammad (Ibn Ḥazm)** and thus **accused him of being a Jahmī**.
But in these texts and others, he clearly **affirmed the Names of Allah the Exalted**, unlike the **Jahmiyyah**, who declared them invalid on the grounds that they necessitate resemblance (tashbīh), according to their view.

Therefore, **whoever claims that Ibn Ḥazm agrees with the Jahmiyyah in negating the Names of Allah—which is the position of the Jahmiyyah—is mistaken**.
And if he knew of this statement of Ibn Ḥazm and **persisted in opposing it**, then **he is lying**.

In these texts as well, **Ibn Ḥazm affirms the meanings of these Names**, in opposition to the Jahmiyyah who **nullified both the Names and their meanings**.
Everything he mentioned here refers to the **meaning** of a Name of Allah the Exalted—not the **Name itself**.

فَمَنْ قَالَ: ابْنُ حَزْمٍ مُوَافِقٌ لِلْجَهْمِيَّةِ فِي إِبْطَالِ مَعَانِي أَسْمَاءِ اللهِ تَعَالَى (وَهِيَ الصِّفَاتُ عِنْدَ ابْنِ تَيْمِيَةَ): فَهُوَ مُخْطِئٌ، وَإِنْ كَانَ عَالِمًا بِقَوْلِ ابْنِ حَزْمٍ هَذَا فَكَرَّرَ خِلَافَهُ: فَهُوَ كَاذِبٍ

أَمَّا قَوْلُ أَبِي مُحَمَّدٍ: (لَا يَجُوزُ أَنْ نُطْلِقَ الصِّفَاتِ لِلهِ تَعَالَى)، أَيْ: لَا يَجُوزُ أَنْ نُطْلِقَ عَلَيْهِ تَعَالَى، أَوْ عَلَى أَسْمَائِهِ، أَوْ عَلَى مَعَانِي هَذِهِ الْأَسْمَاءِ لَفْظَةَ (الصِّفَةِ) لِأَنَّ اللهَ تَعَالَى لَمْ يُطْلِقْ ذَلِكَ، وَكُلُّ غَيْبٍ: فَالإِثْبَاتُ فِيهِ وَالنَّفْيُ يَكُونُ بِنَصٍّ صَحِيحٍ.

وَقَدْ ذَكَرْتُ آنِفًا أَنَّ ابْنَ حَزْمٍ نَسَبَ هَذَا الْقَوْلَ إِلَى الشَّافِعِيِّ، وَدَاوُدَ، وَالْكَرَابِيسِيِّ، وَعَبْدِ الْعَزِيزِ الْكِنَانِيِّ، وَقَالَ بِأَنَّهُمْ يَقُولُونَ: نَقُولُ سَمِيعٌ وَلَا نَقُولُ بِصِفَةِ السَّمْعِ، بَصِيرٌ وَلَا نَقُولُ بِصِفَةِ الْبَصَرِ، أَيْ: يَكْفِي قَوْلُنَا: السَّمِيعُ، الْبَصِيرُ، لِنَفْهَمَ الْمَعْنَى مِنْهُمَا.

وَهَذَا نَجِدُهُ نَصًّا عَنِ الْكِنَانِيِّ فِي كِتَابِ «الْحِيدَةِ» فِي مُنَاظَرَةِ الْجَهْمِيَّةِ.

وَقَوْلُ أَبِي مُحَمَّدٍ فِي رَدِّهِ عَلَى الْجَهْمِيَّةِ حِينَ زَعَمُوا أَنَّ إِثْبَاتَ الْأَسْمَاءِ أَوْ مَعَانِيهَا وَالَّتِي يُطْلِقُ عَلَيْهَا الْمُتَأَخِّرُ اسْمَ «الصِّفَةِ» يُوجِبُ إِثْبَاتَ غَيْرِ اللهِ مَعَ اللهِ، فَهَدَمَ عَلَيْهِمْ أَبُو مُحَمَّدٍ هَذَا الْقَوْلَ حِينَ قَالَ مَا مَعْنَاهُ: إِنَّ أَسْمَاءَ اللهِ تَعَالَى كُلَّهَا لَا تَدُلُّ إِلَّا عَلَى اللهِ تَعَالَى، وَلَا تَدُلُّ عَلَى غَيْرِهِ، فَلَا فَرْقَ بَيْنَ قَوْلِكَ عَنِ اللهِ تَعَالَى: السَّمِيعُ، وَالْعَلِيمُ، وَالْبَصِيرُ، وَالْحَلِيمُ، وَالْخَبِيرُ، وَالْحَكِيمُ، وَالْقَدِيرُ، وَغَيْرِ ذَلِكَ مِنْ أَسْمَاءٍ، فَكُلُّ هَذِهِ الْأَسْمَاءِ لِمُسَمًّى وَاحِدٍ وَهُوَ اللهُ تَعَالَى، وَلَا تَدُلُّ عَلَى غَيْرِهِ.

فَمَنْ لَمْ يَفْهَمْ كَلَامَ أَبِي مُحَمَّدٍ، فَلْيَرْجِعْ إِلَى هَذِهِ النُّصُوصِ الَّتِي ذَكَرْتُهَا عَنْ أَبِي مُحَمَّدٍ، ثُمَّ لِيُقِرَّ فِي نَفْسِهِ -إِنْ كَانَ يَخْشَى الْمَلَامَةَ- بِخَطَإِ كُلِّ مَنْ نَقَلَ عَنْهُ خِلَافَ مَا ذَكَرْتُهُ عَنْهُ هُنَا بِلِسَانِهِ.

فَلِذَلِكَ قُلْتُ فِي أَوَّلِ الْمَقَالَةِ: الْخِلَافُ بَيْنَ ابْنِ حَزْمٍ وَابْنِ تَيْمِيَّةَ خِلَافٌ شَكْلِيٌّ، فَإِذَا قُلْتَ: أَنَا أَقُولُ بِثُبُوتِ أَسْمَاءِ اللهِ تَعَالَى كَمَا نَصَّ عَلَيْهَا فِي الْقُرْآنِ أَوِ السُّنَّةِ الصَّحِيحَةِ، وَأَقُولُ بِثُبُوتِ مَعَانِيهَا أَيْضًا: فَأَنْتَ عَلَى الْحَقِّ عِنْدَ ابْنِ حَزْمٍ وَعِنْدَ ابْنِ تَيْمِيَّةَ أَيْضًا.

لِأَنَّ «الصِّفَةَ» عِنْدَ ابْنِ تَيْمِيَّةَ مَا هِيَ إِلَّا مَعْنَى الِاسْمِ الْمُسْتَفَادِ، فَإِذَا أَثْبَتَّ مَعْنَى الِاسْمِ وَلَمْ تُطْلِقْ عَلَيْهِ اسْمَ (صِفَةٍ) فَخِلَافُكَ مَعَ غَيْرِكَ شَكْلِيٌّ غَيْرُ مُفْسِدٍ.

So whoever says that *Ibn Hazm agrees with the Jahmiyyah in negating the meanings of the Names of Allah Most High* (which, according to Ibn Taymiyyah, are the attributes), then he is mistaken. And if he knows this statement of Ibn Hazm and still repeats the opposition, then he is a liar.

As for the statement of Abu Muhammad (Ibn Hazm): *"It is not permissible to apply the term 'attribute' (ṣifah) to Allah Most High — meaning: it is not permissible to apply this term to Him, or to His Names, or to the meanings of these Names — because Allah did not apply this term. And anything related to the unseen must be affirmed or negated only through authentic text."*

I have previously mentioned that Ibn Hazm attributed this view to al-Shāfiʿī, Dāwūd, al-Karābīsī, and ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Kinānī, and he said they held: *"We say He is All-Hearing (Samīʿ), but we do not say He has the attribute of hearing; He is All-Seeing (Baṣīr), but we do not say He has the attribute of sight"* — meaning: it is sufficient to say "the All-Hearing, the All-Seeing" to understand the meaning from the Names themselves.

This is found explicitly from al-Kinānī in his book *al-Ḥīda*, in his debate with the Jahmiyyah.

Abu Muhammad's statement in refutation of the Jahmiyyah — when they claimed that affirming the Names or their meanings (which the later scholars call "attributes") implies affirming something other than Allah alongside Allah — was to dismantle this claim by saying something to the effect of: *"All the Names of Allah Most High point only to Allah Himself, and not to anything other than Him. So there is no difference between saying about Allah: the All-Hearing, the All-Knowing, the All-Seeing, the Forbearing, the All-Aware, the Wise, the All-Powerful, and other such Names — for all these Names refer to one Named Being, and that is Allah Most High, and they do not indicate anything other than Him."*

So whoever does not fully understand Abu Muhammad's words, let him return to these texts I have cited from him, and then let him admit — if he fears blame — that everyone who has transmitted from him an opinion contrary to what I have presented here in his own words is mistaken.

For this reason I said at the beginning of this article: *The disagreement between Ibn Hazm and Ibn Taymiyyah is only formal (i.e., terminological).*

So if you say: *"I affirm the Names of Allah as stated in the Qur'an or authentic Sunnah, and I affirm their meanings as well,"* then you are upon the truth — according to both Ibn Hazm and Ibn Taymiyyah.

Because the term "attribute" (ṣifah), according to Ibn Taymiyyah, is nothing but the meaning derived from the Name. So if you affirm the meaning of the Name, but do not label it as an "attribute," then your disagreement with others is merely formal and does not lead to any corruption or falsehood.

وَقَدْ قُلْتُ مَرَّةً لِمَنْ نَاظَرْتُهُ فِي هَذِهِ الْمَسْأَلَةِ: هَلْ مَنْ أَثْبَتَ الْأَسْمَاءَ وَالْمَعَانِيَ يَكُونُ عَلَى خَطَإٍ؟ فَقَالَ: لَا.

وَإِنَّمَا يَكُونُ ابْنُ تَيْمِيَّةَ وَمَنْ وَافَقَهُ عَلَى خَطَإٍ عِنْدَ ابْنِ حَزْمٍ إِنْ كَانَ قَدْ أَطْلَقَ لَفْظَ (الصِّفَةِ) عَلَى اللَّهِ تَعَالَى وَهُوَ غَيْرُ عَالِمٍ بِمَعْنَاهَا الَّذِي أَرَادَهُ أَهْلُ الْكَلَامِ، وَقَدِ الْتَمَسَ ابْنُ حَزْمٍ لَهُمُ الْعُذْرَ كَمَا تَقَدَّمَ، أَمَّا الْعَالِمُ بِالْمَعْنَى الَّذِي أَرَادَهُ أَهْلُ الْكَلَامِ، وَأَثْبَتَ تِلْكَ اللَّفْظَةَ قَاصِدًا ذَلِكَ الْمَعْنَى: فَيَكُونُ مِنَ الضَّلَالِ وَالْبِدْعَةِ عِنْدَ ابْنِ حَزْمٍ.

وَكُلُّ قَوْلٍ يَقْتَضِي مِثْلَ هَذَا الِاحْتِمَالِ وَالِاشْتِبَاهِ عِنْدَ السَّامِعِ، وَلَا يُفْهَمُ مَعْنَاهُ إِذَا أُطْلِقَ: فَتَرْكُهُ هُوَ الْحَقُّ؛ لِأَنَّ الْمُثْبِتَ لِلْأَسْمَاءِ الْمَنْصُوصِ عَلَيْهَا، وَالْمُثْبِتَ أَنَّهَا دَالَّةٌ عَلَى مَعْنًى مَا فَلَا يَحْتَاجُ إِلَى كَلِمَةِ (صِفَةٍ) لِيُقَرِّرَ ثُبُوتَ مَعْنَى الْأَسْمَاءِ، فَذَلِكَ لَوْ تَرَكَهَا تَارِكٌ وَهُوَ يُقِرُّ الِاسْمَ وَالْمَعْنَى كَانَ مُوَافِقًا لِلنَّصِّ، وَغَيْرَ مُخَالِفٍ لَهُ.

إِذَنْ: النَّاقِلُ لِمَذْهَبِ أَبِي مُحَمَّدٍ فِي هَذِهِ الْمَسْأَلَةِ يَجِبُ عَلَيْهِ أَنْ يَتَثَبَّتَ وَيَرْجِعَ إِلَى كُتُبِ أَبِي مُحَمَّدٍ، فَإِنْ وَجَدَهُ يُثْبِتُ الْأَسْمَاءَ وَيُثْبِتُ الْمَعَانِيَ كَمَا تَقَدَّمَ بِالنَّصِّ الْوَاضِحِ: فَالْوَاجِبُ عَلَيْهِ أَنْ يَكُفَّ عَنْ تَرْدِيدِ هَذَا النَّقْلِ غَيْرِ الصَّحِيحِ، وَالْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ رَبِّ الْعَالَمِينَ.

وَالْمَرْجُوُّ مِنَ الْإِخْوَةِ: مَنْ أَرَادَ مَعْرِفَةَ مَسَائِلَ بِعَيْنِهَا فَلْيَرْجِعْ إِلَى أَوَّلِ كِتَابِ «الْمُحَلَّى»، وَكِتَابِ «الدُّرَّةِ فِيمَا يَجِبُ اعْتِقَادُهُ»، وَكِتَابِ «الْفِصَلِ»، فَفِي هَذِهِ الْكُتُبِ مَذْهَبُ أَبِي مُحَمَّدٍ فِي مَسَائِلِ التَّوْحِيدِ.

He said: "No."

And I once said to someone I was debating with on this issue:
"Is the one who affirms the names and their meanings necessarily mistaken?"

Ibn Taymiyyah and those who agree with him would only be considered mistaken **according to Ibn Ḥazm if** they **used the term 'attribute' (ṣifah)** for Allah **without knowing** the meaning intended by the **theologians (Ahl al-Kalām)**.

Ibn Ḥazm had sought an **excuse** for such people, as has been mentioned previously.

But as for the one who **knows** the meaning **intended by the theologians** and then **affirms** that term while intending **that specific meaning—**then such a person, according to Ibn Ḥazm, is guilty of **misguidance** and **innovation**.

Every expression that leads to this type of **possibility and confusion** for the listener**—**such that its **meaning is not understood when it is uttered without explanation—**then **abandoning it is the correct path**.
Because the one who affirms the **names** mentioned in the texts, and affirms that these names point to **some meaning**, does **not need** the word "attribute (ṣifah)" to affirm the meanings of the names. So, **if someone avoids using that term**, while affirming both the **name** and the **meaning**, then he is in **agreement with the text** and **not in opposition to it**.

Therefore, anyone reporting the **position of Abū Muḥammad (Ibn Ḥazm)** on this issue must **verify it carefully** and go back to his original books.
If he finds that Ibn Ḥazm affirms the **names** and affirms the **meanings**, as has clearly been stated in the cited texts, then it is **obligatory** on him to **stop repeating that incorrect report**.
All praise is due to Allah, the Lord of the Worlds.

It is **hoped** from the brothers that **whoever wants to know** Ibn Ḥazm's exact views on specific issues should go back to:

- the **beginning of the book *al-Muḥallā***,
- the book ***al-Durra fīmā Yajibu Iʿtiqāduh***,
- and the book ***al-Faṣl***.

For in these books lies **the true position of Abū Muḥammad (Ibn Ḥazm)** on the matters of **Tawḥīd (monotheism)**.

الفَصْلُ الثَّانِي: الرَّدُّ عَلَىٰ دَعْوَة ابْنِ القَيِّمِ

قَالَ عَبْدُ الْعَزِيزِ الحَرْبِيّ الظَّاهِرِيُّ : قَالَ ابْنُ حَزْمٍ فِي «الفَصْلِ» (٧/٣): ثُمَّ نَقُولُ إِنَّ قَوْلَنَا القُرْآنُ وَقَوْلَنَا كَلَامُ اللهِ لَفْظٌ مُشْتَرَكٌ يُعَبَّرُ بِهِ عَنْ خَمْسَةِ أَشْيَاءَ: الصَّوْتُ الْمَسْمُوعُ وَالْمَلْفُوظُ بِهِ، أَوْ (الْمَنْطُوق) وَالْمُصْحَفُ والْمُسْتَقَرُّ فِي الصُّدُورِ والقُرْآنُ هُوَ كَلَامُ اللهِ، وَهُوَ عِلْمُهُ.

ثُمَّ قَالَ بَعْدَ سَرْدِ الْأَدِلَّةِ عَلَى ذٰلِكَ: فَهٰذِهِ خَمْسَةُ مَعَانٍ يُعَبَّرُ عَنْ كُلِّ مَعْنًى مِنْهَا بِأَنَّهُ قُرْآنٌ، وَأَنَّهُ كَلَامُ اللهِ، وَيُخْبَرُ عَنْ كُلِّ وَاحِدٍ مِنْهَا إِخْبَارًا صَحِيحًا بِأَنَّهُ القُرْآنُ، وَأَنَّهُ كَلَامُ اللهِ تَعَالَى بِنَصِّ القُرْآنِ وَالسُّنَّةِ اللَّذَيْنِ أَجْمَعَ عَلَيْهِمَا جَمِيعُ الْأُمَّةِ.

ثُمَّ قَرَّرَ أَنَّ الصَّوْتَ فَهُوَ هَوَاءٌ مُنْدَفِعٌ مِنَ الحَلْقِ وَالصَّدْرِ وَالحَنَكِ وَاللِّسَانِ وَالأَسْنَانِ وَالشَّفَتَيْنِ إِلَى آذَانِ السَّامِعِينَ، وَهُوَ حُرُوفُ الْهِجَاءِ، وَالْهَوَاءُ، وَالْوَرَقُ، وَالْمِدَادُ، كُلُّ ذٰلِكَ مَخْلُوقٌ.

ثُمَّ قَالَ: وَلَمَّا كَانَ اسْمُ القُرْآنِ يَقَعُ عَلَى خَمْسَةِ أَشْيَاءَ وُقُوعًا مُسْتَوِيًا صَحِيحًا، مِنْهَا أَرْبَعَةٌ مَخْلُوقَةٌ، وَوَاحِدٌ غَيْرُ مَخْلُوقٍ، لَمْ يَجُزِ الْبَتَّةَ لِأَحَدٍ أَنْ يَقُولَ: إِنَّ القُرْآنَ مَخْلُوقٌ، وَلَا أَنْ يَقُولَ: إِنَّ كَلَامَ اللهِ مَخْلُوقٌ، لِأَنَّ قَائِلَ هٰذَا كَاذِبٌ، إِذْ أَوْقَعَ صِفَةَ الْخَلْقِ عَلَى مَا لَا يَقَعُ عَلَيْهِ مِمَّا يَقَعُ عَلَيْهِ اسْمُ قُرْآنٍ، وَاسْمُ كَلَامِ اللهِ... إلَخ

قَالَ عَبْدُ الْعَزِيزِ: ثُمَّ جَاءَ الإِمَامُ ابْنُ قَيِّمِ الْجَوْزِيَّةِ فِي «النُّونِيَّةِ» فَقَالَ:

وَأَتَى ابْنُ حَزْمٍ بَعْدَ ذٰلِكَ فَقَالَ مَا لِلنَّاسِ قُرْآنٌ وَلَا اثْنَانِ

Chapter Two: Refutation of Ibn al-Qayyim’s Claim

ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Ḥarbī said:

Ibn Ḥazm said in *al-Fiṣl* (7/3):

> “We say that our statement *‘the Qur’an’* and our statement *‘the Speech of Allah’* is a shared term that is used to refer to five things:
>
> - The audible voice,
> - What is spoken or articulated,
> - The **muṣḥaf** (the written copy of the Qur’an),
> - What is established in the hearts (i.e., memorized),
> - And [lastly], the Qur’an is the **Speech of Allah**, and it is **His Knowledge**.”

Then, after presenting the evidences for that, he said:

> “These are five meanings, each of which may rightly and correctly be referred to as ‘the Qur’an’ and ‘the Speech of Allah,’ and it is valid to describe each one of them as such, based on the explicit texts of the Qur’an and Sunnah—texts upon which the entire Ummah is agreed.”

Then he explained that:

> “Sound is air pushed out from the chest, throat, palate, tongue, teeth, and lips to the ears of the hearers. It consists of letters of the alphabet. Air, paper, and ink—all of these are **created**.”

Then he said:

> “Since the name ‘Qur’an’ applies equally and correctly to **five things**, four of which are **created**, and one of which is **uncreated**, then it is **absolutely impermissible** for anyone to say: *‘The Qur’an is created’* or *‘The Speech of Allah is created.’*
>
> For anyone who says this is **lying**, because he has applied the attribute of createdness to something that the name ‘Qur’an’ refers to, while this attribute does **not apply** to **all** that is called Qur’an or Speech of Allah…”

Etc.

ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz continues:

> Then came **Imām Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyyah** in his *Nūniyyah* and said:
>
> **“Then Ibn Ḥazm came after that and said: ‘The people have no Qur’an, nor even two Qur’ans.’”**

بَلْ أَرْبَعٌ كُلٌّ يُسَمَّى بِالقُرْآنِ وَذٰلِكَ قَوْلٌ بَيِّنُ الْبُطْلَانِ

هٰذَا الَّذِي يُتْلَى وَآخَرُ ثَابِتٌ فِي الرَّسْمِ يُدْعَى الْمُصْحَفَ العُثْمَانِي

وَالثَّالِثُ الْمَحْفُوظُ بَيْنَ صُدُورِنَا هٰذِي الثَّلَاثُ خَلِيفَةُ الرَّحْمَانِ

وَالرَّابِعُ الْمَعْنَى القَدِيمُ كَعِلْمِهِ كُلٌّ يُعَبَّرُ عَنْهُ بِالقُرْآنِ

وَأَظُنُّهُ قَدْ رَامَ شَيْئًا لَمْ يَجِدْ عَنْهُ عِبَارَةَ نَاطِقٍ بِبَيَانِ

إِنَّ الْمُعَيَّنَ ذُو مَرَاتِبَ أَرْبَعٍ عَقَلْتَ فَلَا تَخْفَى عَلَى إِنْسَانِ

فِي الْعَيْنِ ثُمَّ الذِّهْنِ ثُمَّ اللَّفْظِ ثُمَّ الرَّسْمِ حِينَ تَخُطُّهُ بِبَنَانِ

وَعَلَى الْجَمِيعِ الِاسْمُ يُطْلَقُ لكِنْ الأُولَى بِهِ الْمَوْجُودُ فِي الْأَعْيَانِ

قَالَ عَبْدُ الْعَزِيزِ الحَرْبِيّ: أَرَادَ الإِمَامُ ابْنُ حَزْمٍ بِقَوْلِهِ: (مِنْهَا أَرْبَعَةٌ مَخْلُوقَةٌ) رُتَبَ الْوُجُودِ لِمَا يُسَمَّى قُرْآنًا، يُوَضِّحُ ذٰلِكَ مَا جَاءَ عَنْهُ فِي كِتَابِ «الدُّرَّةِ» (٢٥٥ ـ ٢٥٦):

وَالْقُرْآنُ كَلَامُ اللهِ، عَزَّ وَجَلَّ، وَهُوَ عِلْمُ اللهِ تَعَالَى، غَيْرُ مَخْلُوقٍ، وَيُعَبَّرُ بِالقُرْآنِ، وَبِكَلَامِ اللهِ ـ تَعَالَى ـ عَنْ خَمْسَةِ مُسَمَّيَاتٍ: يُعَبَّرُ بِذٰلِكَ عَنْ عِلْمِ اللهِ، عَزَّ وَجَلَّ، وَعَنِ الْمَسْمُوعِ فِي الْمَحَارِيبِ. قَالَ تَعَالَى: (حَتَّىٰ يَسْمَعَ كَلَامَ اللهِ). وَعَنِ الْمَحْفُوظِ فِي الصُّدُورِ، قَالَ تَعَالَى: (بَلْ هُوَ آيَاتٌ بَيِّنَاتٌ فِي صُدُورِ الَّذِينَ أُوتُوا الْعِلْمَ). وَعَنِ الْمَكْتُوبِ فِي الْمُصْحَفِ، قَالَ تَعَالَى: (بَلْ هُوَ قُرْآنٌ مَجِيدٌ. فِي لَوْحٍ مَحْفُوظٍ). وَقَالَ تَعَالَى: (فَمَنْ شَاءَ ذَكَرَهُ. فِي صُحُفٍ مُكَرَّمَةٍ. مَرْفُوعَةٍ مُطَهَّرَةٍ. بِأَيْدِي سَفَرَةٍ كِرَامٍ بَرَرَةٍ). وَنَهَى ﷺ "أَنْ يُسَافَرَ بِالقُرْآنِ إِلَى أَرْضِ الْحَرْبِ". وَعَنِ الْمَعَانِي الْمَفْهُومَةِ مِنَ التِّلَاوَةِ. فَكُلُّ هٰذِهِ الْأَرْبَعَةِ إِذَا أُفْرِدَتْ، وَعُبِّرَ عَنْهَا بِالصَّوْتِ، وَالْخَطِّ (وَعِلْمِنَا)، وَالْمُسَمَّيَاتِ ـ حَاشَا اللهَ تَعَالَى ـ فَكُلُّ ذٰلِكَ مَخْلُوقٌ، وَإِذَا عُبِّرَ بِهِ عَنْ عِلْمِ اللهِ، عَزَّ وَجَلَّ، فَهُوَ غَيْرُ مَخْلُوقٍ، وَإِذَا أُطْلِقَ جُمْلَةً فَهُوَ غَيْرُ مَخْلُوقٍ، لِأَنَّهُ يُعَبَّرُ بِهِ عَنْ عِلْمِ اللهِ، عَزَّ وَجَلَّ

Rather, Four—Each One Called “the Qur’an”
And that is a clearly false statement.
This one that is recited,
And another preserved in script, called the ʿUthmānic muṣḥaf,
And the third is what is memorized in our chests—
These three are the caliphs of the All-Merciful,
And the fourth is the eternal meaning like His knowledge—
Each one is referred to as “the Qur’an.”
I think he (Ibn Ḥazm) was trying to express something
But could not find for it an articulate, clear expression.
Indeed, any particular (thing) has **four levels**:
In external existence, then in the mind, then in speech, then in written form,
When you trace it with your fingers.
And the name (Qur’an) applies to all of them—
But the one most deserving of it is the one that exists in the external world.

ʿ**Abd al-**ʿ**Azīz al-Ḥarbī** said:

What Imām Ibn Ḥazm meant by his statement: *“Among them are four that are created”*
Is the **levels of existence** for that which is named “Qur’an.”
This is clarified by what came from him in the book **al-Durra** (pp. 255–256):

> “The Qur’an is the **Speech of Allah**, Exalted is He, and it is **the Knowledge of Allah**, not created.
>
> The term ‘Qur’an’ and ‘Speech of Allah’ can refer to **five things**:
>
> - It can refer to the **Knowledge of Allah**, Exalted is He.
> - It can refer to what is **heard** in the prayer niches (i.e., recited aloud). Allah says:
>
>   *“…until he hears the speech of Allah.”*
> - It can refer to what is **preserved in hearts**. Allah says:
>
>   *“Rather, it is clear verses in the breasts of those who have been given knowledge.”*
> - It can refer to what is **written in the muṣḥaf**. Allah says:
>
>   *“Rather, it is a glorious Qur’an [kept] in a preserved tablet.”*
>   And He says: *“So whoever wills may remember it in honored scriptures, exalted and purified, carried by the hands of scribes—noble and righteous.”*
>   The Prophet ﷺ forbade traveling with the Qur’an into enemy lands.
> - It can also refer to the **meanings understood from recitation**.

So all of these four—if considered separately,
and if referred to by **sound**, **script**, **our knowledge**, or the **things named—**
then, **all of that is created**,
except the Knowledge of Allah, Exalted is He.
So if the expression refers to His Knowledge, then it is **not created**,
and if used in a general sense, then it is **not created**,
because it refers to the **Knowledge of Allah**, Exalted is He.

وقالَ في «المحلَّى» (٢/٧٧) مسألة (٥٨): «والقُرآنُ كلامُ ٱللهِ تعالى، وَعِلمُهُ غَيرُ مَخلوقٍ. قالَ ٱللهُ عَزَّ وَجلَّ: ﴿وَلَوْلَا كَلِمَةٌ سَبَقَتْ مِن رَّبِّكَ لَقُضِيَ بَيْنَهُمْ﴾، فَأَخْبَرَ عَزَّ وَجلَّ أَنَّ كَلامَهُ هُوَ عِلْمُهُ تَعالى لَمْ يَزَلْ غَيْرَ مَخْلُوقٍ».

وقالَ في مسألة (٥٩): «وَهُوَ الْمَكْتُوبُ فِي الْمَصَاحِفِ، وَالْمَسْمُوعُ مِنَ الْقَارِئِ، وَالْمَحْفُوظُ فِي الصُّدُورِ، وَالَّذِي نَزَلَ بِهِ جِبْرِيلُ عَلَى قَلْبِ مُحَمَّدٍ ﷺ: كُلُّ ذَلِكَ كِتَابُ ٱللهِ تَعَالَى وَكَلَامُهُ، الْقُرْآنُ حَقِيقَةً، لَا مَجَازًا، مَنْ قَالَ فِي شَيْءٍ مِنْ هَذَا أَنَّهُ لَيْسَ هُوَ الْقُرْآنَ، فَقَدْ كَفَرَ، لِخِلَافِهِ ٱللهَ تَعَالَى وَرَسُولَهُ ﷺ، وَإِجْمَاعِ أَهْلِ الْإِسْلَامِ».

وقالَ في «المحلَّى» (٢/٣٧) رقم (٢١): «وَأَنَّ الْقُرْآنَ الَّذِي فِي الْمَصَاحِفِ بِأَيْدِي الْمُسْلِمِينَ شَرْقًا وَغَرْبًا، فَمَا بَيْنَ ذَلِكَ، مِنْ أَوَّلِ أُمِّ الْقُرْآنِ إِلَى آخِرِ الْمُعَوِّذَتَيْنِ، كَلَامُ ٱللهِ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ وَوَحْيُهُ، أَنْزَلَهُ عَلَى قَلْبِ نَبِيِّهِ مُحَمَّدٍ ﷺ، مَنْ كَفَرَ بِحَرْفٍ مِنْهُ، فَهُوَ كَافِرٌ».

قالَ عبدُالعَزيز الحَرْبِيّ: فَالْقَوْلُ الْمَنْسُوبُ إِلَى الْإِمَامِ ابْنِ حَزْمٍ فِي مَسْأَلَةِ الْقُرْآنِ لَيْس (بِصَحِيحٍ). اُنْظُرْ حَوْلَ هَذِهِ الْمَسْأَلَةِ مَا سَطَّرَهُ فِي كِتَابِهِ الْمَوْسُومِ بِـ«الْأُصُولِ وَالْفُرُوعِ» (٢/٣٩٤–٤٠٠).

قالَ شَيْخُ الْإِسْلَامِ ابْنُ تَيْمِيَةَ فِي «نَقْضِ الْمَنْطِقِ» (ص ١٧–١٨): وَيَقُولُ: إِنَّهُ مُوَافِقٌ لِلْإِمَامِ أَحْمَدَ فِي مَسْأَلَةِ الْقُرْآنِ وَغَيْرِهَا، وَلَا رَيْبَ أَنَّهُ مُوَافِقٌ لَهُ وَلَهُمْ فِي بَعْضِ ذَلِكَ.

قالَ عبدُالعَزيز الحَرْبِيّ: وَرَتَّبَ الْوُجُودَ أَرْبَعَةً: وُجُودٌ عَيْنِيٌّ، وَوُجُودٌ ذِهْنِيٌّ، وَوُجُودٌ لَفْظِيٌّ، وَوُجُودٌ رَسْمِيٌّ. وَقَدْ فَصَّلَ الْقَوْلَ فِيهَا الْإِمَامُ ابْنُ قَيِّمِ الْجَوْزِيَّةِ فِي كِتَابِهِ الْجَلِيلِ «الصَّوَاعِقُ الْمُرْسَلَةُ».

وَقَدْ نَبَّهَ إِلَى هَذَا الْخَطَإِ الْمَنْسُوبِ إِلَى الْإِمَامِ ابْنِ حَزْمٍ ـ رَحِمَهُ ٱللهُ ـ الْعَلَّامَةُ ابْنُ عَقِيلٍ الظَّاهِرِيُّ ـ حَفِظَهُ ٱللهُ ـ فَقَالَ: «وَأَرْفُضُ سَفَاهَةَ ابْنِ قَيِّمِ الْجَوْزِيَّةِ رَحِمَهُ ٱللهُ فِي حَقِّ الْإِمَامِ ابْنِ حَزْمٍ، مُخَالِفًا شَيْخَهُ الْإِمَامَ ابْنَ تَيْمِيَةَ رَحِمَهُمُ ٱللهُ تَعَالَى، فِي قَوْلِهِ: **وَالشَّيْءُ شَيْءٌ وَاحِدٌ لَا أَرْبَعَ ... فَدَهى ابْنَ حَزْمٍ قِلَّةُ الْعِرْفَانِ** وَقَوَّلَ الْإِمَامَ ابْنَ حَزْمٍ مَا لَمْ يَقُلْ، وَابْنُ قَيِّمِ الْجَوْزِيَّةِ حَاوٍ لِبَعْضِ اخْتِلَافِ الْعُلَمَاءِ، لَا يَصِلُ إِلَى دَرَجَةِ الْإِمَامِ الْمُجْتَهِدِ بِإِطْلَاقٍ، وَلَا إِلَى دَرَجَةِ الْإِمَامِ ابْنِ حَزْمٍ – وَهُوَ مُجْتَهِدٌ بِإِطْلَاقٍ – مَهْمَا كَانَ عِنْدَهُ مِنْ هَفَوَاتٍ، وَكَلِمَةُ (دهى)، وَالْوَصْفُ بِالْجَهْلِ (قِلَّةُ الْعِرْفَانِ) تَزْكِيَةٌ لِلنَّفْسِ، وَظُلْمٌ لِإِمَامٍ مِنْ أَئِمَّةِ الْمُسْلِمِينَ.

Here is a full English translation of the text you provided:

He (Ibn Hazm) said in *al-Muḥallā* (2/77), issue (58):
"The Qur'an is the speech of Allah, and His knowledge — it is not created. Allah the Almighty said: {And had it not been for a word that had preceded from your Lord, their matter would have been judged between them} [Qur'an 10:19].
So, Allah the Exalted informed us that His speech is His knowledge — eternal, uncreated."

And he said in issue (59):
"It is that which is written in the muṣḥafs (copies of the Qur'an), heard from the reciters, memorized in the hearts, and that which Jibrīl (Gabriel) brought down to the heart of Muḥammad ﷺ — all of that is the Book of Allah, His speech, the Qur'an in truth, not metaphorically.
Whoever claims that any of this is not the Qur'an, has disbelieved — for he opposes Allah, His Messenger, and the consensus of the Muslims."

He also said in *al-Muḥallā* (2/37), number (21):
"The Qur'an that is in the muṣḥafs held by the Muslims — in the East and the West and all in between — from the beginning of Umm al-Qur'an (Sūrat al-Fātiḥah) to the end of al-Muʿawwidhatayn (the two refuge-seeking chapters), is the speech of Allah the Exalted, His revelation, which He sent down to the heart of His Prophet Muḥammad ﷺ. Whoever disbelieves in even one letter of it, he is a disbeliever."

ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Ḥarbī said:
"The statement attributed to Imām Ibn Ḥazm regarding the Qur'an is not correct.
See what he himself wrote regarding this issue in his book *al-Uṣūl wa-l-Furūʿ* (2/394–400)."

Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah said in *Naqḍ al-Manṭiq* (pp. 17–18):
"And he [Ibn Ḥazm] says that he agrees with Imām Aḥmad on the issue of the Qur'an and others. Without a doubt, he agrees with him in some of that."

ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Ḥarbī also said:
"He (Ibn Ḥazm) categorized existence into four types: real/external existence, mental existence, verbal existence, and written existence.
This categorization was elaborated by Imām Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyyah in his great book *al-Ṣawāʿiq al-Mur'sala*."

The scholar Ibn ʿAqīl — may Allah preserve him — pointed out the mistake attributed to Imām Ibn Ḥazm — may Allah have mercy on him — and said:
"I reject the foolishness of Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyyah — may Allah have mercy on him — regarding Imām Ibn Ḥazm.
He contradicted his own teacher, Imām Ibn Taymiyyah — may Allah have mercy on them both — when he said: 'A thing is one thing, not four.' Ibn al-Qayyim thus misrepresented Ibn Ḥazm out of lack of understanding, attributing to him what he never said. Ibn al-Qayyim was someone who grasped aspects of scholarly disagreement, but he does not reach the level of a fully independent *mujtahid* scholar in an absolute sense, nor does he match Imām Ibn Ḥazm — who was an absolute *mujtahid* — even if the latter had his slips.**

And the term *(dahā)* — which implies ‘was ruined by’ — and the accusation of ignorance (‘lack of understanding’) — is nothing but self-praise and injustice to one of the Imams of the Muslims."**

وَهُنَا ظُلْمٌ آخَرُ، وَهُوَ أَنَّهُ قَوَّلَهُ مَا لَمْ يَقُلْ؛ فَلَمْ يَدَّعِ الْإِمَامُ ابْنُ حَزْمٍ أَنَّ الْقُرْآنَ أَرْبَعَةُ أَشْيَاءَ، وَإِنَّمَا ذَكَرَ رُتَبَ قُرْآنٍ وَاحِدٍ فِي الْوُجُودِ فَرَّعَهَا الْمُتَكَلِّمُونَ؛ فَبَيَّنَ حُكْمَ كُلِّ رُتْبَةٍ.

قَالَ رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ تَعَالَى فِي «الْفَصْلِ» (٤١/٢): «فَهَذِهِ خَمْسَةُ مَعَانٍ يُعَبَّرُ عَنْ كُلِّ مَعْنًى مِنْهَا بِأَنَّهُ قُرْآنٌ، وَبِأَنَّهُ كَلَامُ ٱللَّهِ تَعَالَى، وَيُخْبَرُ عَنْ كُلِّ وَاحِدٍ مِنْهَا أَخْبَارًا صَحِيحَةً بِأَنَّهُ قُرْآنٌ، وَبِأَنَّهُ كَلَامُ ٱللَّهِ تَعَالَى بِنَصِّ الْقُرْآنِ وَالسُّنَّةِ اللَّذَيْنِ أَجْمَعَ عَلَيْهِمَا جَمِيعُ الْأُمَّةِ.. وَأَمَّا الصَّوْتُ، فَهُوَ هَوَاءٌ يَنْدَفِعُ مِنَ الْحَلْقِ وَالصَّدْرِ وَالْحَنَكِ وَاللِّسَانِ وَالْأَسْنَانِ وَالشَّفَتَيْنِ إِلَى آذَانِ السَّامِعِ، وَهُوَ حُرُوفُ الْهِجَاءِ، وَالْهَوَاءُ وَحُرُوفُ الْهِجَاءِ، كُلُّ ذَلِكَ مَخْلُوقٌ بِلَا خِلَافٍ». وَانْظُرْ (ص ٣٩–٤١).

"And here is another injustice: attributing to him (Ibn Hazm) what he never said. Imām Ibn Ḥazm never claimed that the Qur'an consists of four separate things. Rather, he spoke of one Qur'an that exists in various forms — classifications which were formulated by the theologians (*mutakallimūn*); he merely clarified the ruling for each level or category.

He — may Allah have mercy on him — said in *al-Faṣl* (2/41):
'These are five meanings, each of which is referred to as the Qur'an and the Speech of Allah. Each of them can be truthfully described — based on the explicit statements of the Qur'an and Sunnah, agreed upon by the entire Ummah — as being the Qur'an and the Speech of Allah.
As for the **sound**, it is nothing but air propelled from the chest, palate, tongue, teeth, and lips of the speaker toward the ears of the listener. It consists of the letters of the alphabet, and this air and those letters are all created — without any disagreement.'"**

See also (pp. 39–41).

:الفَصْلُ الثَّالِثُ: اتِّهَامُ ابْنِ عَبْدِ ٱلْهَادِيّ لِابْنِ حَزْمٍ بِالتَّجَهُّمِ

قَالَ الشَّيْخُ عَبْدُ ٱلْعَزِيزِ الشَّيْخُ عَبْدُ ٱلْعَزِيزِ ٱلْحَنُوطُ الظَّاهِرِيُّ

أَمَّا ٱلْحَافِظُ ابْنُ عَبْدِ ٱلْهَادِيّ وَقَوْلُهُ – أَيِ ٱبْنِ حَزْمٍ – أَنَّ ٱلْأَسْمَاءَ عِندَهُ لَا تَدُلُّ عَلَىٰ مَعْنًى أَصْلًا كَٱلرَّحِيمِ وَٱلْعَلِيمِ وَٱلْقَدِيرِ وَنَحْوِهَا بَلِ ٱلْعِلْمُ عِندَهُ هُوَ ٱلْقُدْرَةُ وَٱلْقُدْرَةُ هِيَ ٱلْعِلْمُ وَهُمَا غَيْرُ ٱلذَّاتِ، وَلَا يَدُلُّ ٱلْعِلْمُ عَلَىٰ مَعْنًى زَائِدٍ عَلَىٰ ٱلذَّاتِ...

قُلتُ: وَنُنقِضُ هَذَا بِكَلَامِ ٱلْإِمَامِ ابْنِ حَزْمٍ – رَحِمَهُ ٱللهُ – قَالَ فِي «ٱلْمُحَلَّى» (٧٨/٢) رَقْمُ (٦٠): «وَعِلْمُ ٱللهِ تَعَالَىٰ حَقٌّ لَمْ يَزَلْ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ عَلِيمًا بِمَا كَانَ أَوْ يَكُونُ مِمَّا دَقَّ أَوْ جَلَّ لَا يَخْفَىٰ عَلَيْهِ شَيْءٌ. قَالَ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ: ﴿وَهُوَ بِكُلِّ شَيْءٍ عَلِيمٌ﴾ وَهَٰذَا عُمُومٌ لَا يَجُوزُ أَنْ يُخَصَّ مِنهُ شَيْءٌ، وَقَالَ تَعَالَىٰ: ﴿يَعْلَمُ السِّرَّ وَأَخْفَىٰ﴾ وَٱلْأَخْفَىٰ مِنَ ٱلسِّرِّ هُوَ مَا يَكُونُ مِمَّا لَمْ يَكُنْ بَعْدُ».

وَقَالَ فِي «ٱلْمُحَلَّى» (٧٩/٢) رَقْمُ (٦١): «وَقُدْرَتُهُ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ وَقُوَّتُهُ حَقٌّ لَا يُعْجِزُهُ شَيْءٌ وَلَا عَنْ كُلِّ مَا يُسْأَلُ عَنْهُ السَّائِلُ مِنْ مُحَالٍ أَوْ غَيْرِهِ مِمَّا لَا يَكُونُ أَبَدًا. قَالَ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ: ﴿أَوَلَمْ يَرَوْا أَنَّ ٱللَّهَ ٱلَّذِي خَلَقَهُمْ هُوَ أَشَدُّ مِنْهُمْ قُوَّةً﴾».

قُلتُ: هَاهُوَ ٱلْإِمَامُ ابْنُ حَزْمٍ – رَحِمَهُ ٱللهُ – تَحَدَّثَ عَنْ عِلْمِ ٱللهِ وَفَسَّرَهُ، ثُمَّ تَحَدَّثَ عَنْ قُوَّةِ وَقُدْرَةِ ٱللهِ فَفَسَّرَهَا

فَفَسَّرَ ٱلْعِلْمَ بِأَنَّهُ لَا يَخْفَىٰ عَلَيْهِ شَيْءٌ، وَٱلْقُدْرَةَ وَٱلْقُوَّةَ بِأَنَّهُ لَا يُعْجِزُهُ شَيْءٌ.

Chapter Three: The Accusation by Ibn ʿAbd al-Hādī Against Ibn Ḥazm of Holding Jahmī Beliefs

Shaykh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Ẓāhirī al-Khnūṭ said:

As for **al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn ʿAbd al-Hādī**, and his claim that **Ibn Ḥazm** held the view that the Divine Names do not indicate any meanings at all — like *al-Raḥīm* (The Merciful), *al-ʿAlīm* (The All-Knowing), *al-Qadīr* (The All-Powerful), and the like — and that **knowledge**, according to him, is *power*, and *power* is *knowledge*, and that both are other than the Essence (of Allah), and that knowledge does not refer to a meaning distinct from the Essence...

I say: This is refuted by the words of Imām Ibn Ḥazm — may Allah have mercy on him. He said in *al-Muḥallā* (2/78), issue no. 60:

> **"The knowledge of Allah, Exalted is He, is true; He has always been All-Knowing of whatever was or will be — whether minute or great — and nothing is hidden from Him. Allah, the Exalted, said:**
> *'And He is All-Knowing of everything'* [Qur'an],
> and this is a general statement that permits no exception. And He, the Exalted, said:
> *'He knows the secret and what is even more hidden'* —
> and 'what is more hidden than the secret' is that which has not yet come to pass."**

And he said in *al-Muḥallā* (2/79), issue no. 61:

> **"His power and strength, Exalted is He, are true; nothing can disable Him — in any matter whatsoever — whether it actually happens or not, including even those things which will never happen. Allah, the Exalted, said:**
> *'Have they not seen that Allah, who created them, is mightier in strength than them?'"*
> [Qur'an]

I say: Here is Imām Ibn Ḥazm — may Allah have mercy on him — speaking clearly about the **knowledge** of Allah and explaining it, and then speaking about the **power** and **strength** of Allah and explaining them.

He defined **knowledge** as: *"Nothing is hidden from Him."*
And defined **power and strength** as: *"Nothing can render Him incapable."*

فَحَدِّثُونِي بِرَبِّكُمْ!

هَلْ هُمَا بِمَعْنًى وَاحِدٍ عِندَ ٱبْنِ حَزْمٍ أَمْ مُخْتَلِفَانِ؟

هَلْ مَعْنَىٰ ٱلْعِلْمِ هُوَ مَعْنَىٰ ٱلْقُوَّةِ وَٱلْقُدْرَةِ هُنَا؟

أَمْ لِكُلٍّ وَاحِدٍ مَعْنًى خَاصٌّ بِهِ؟

السُّؤَالُ هُوَ: هَلْ ٱلْعِلْمُ عِندَ ٱبْنِ حَزْمٍ هُوَ ٱلْقُدْرَةُ وَهَلْ ٱلْقُدْرَةُ عِندَهُ هِيَ ٱلْعِلْمُ؟ هَلْ هُمَا شَيْءٌ وَاحِدٌ؟ بَعْدَ هَذَا النَّقْلِ مِنْ كِتَابِ «ٱلْمُحَلَّى» زَالَ ٱلْإِشْكَالُ وَلِلَّهِ ٱلْحَمْدُ، وَمَا نَقَلْتُهُ مِنْ «ٱلْمُحَلَّى» مَوْجُودٌ فِي كِتَابِ «ٱلْفَصْلِ». فَهُوَ يُثْبِتُ لِلَّهِ ٱلْقُدْرَةَ وَٱلْقُوَّةَ وَٱلْعِلْمَ وَيُفَسِّرُهَا تَفْسِيرًا وَاضِحًا لَا لُبْسَ فِيهِ وَلَا إِشْكَالَ.

فَنَجِدُ أَنَّ ابْنَ عَبْدِ ٱلْهَادِيّ تَكَلَّمَ بِكَلَامٍ لَمْ يَقُلْهُ ابْنُ حَزْمٍ، وَقَالَ بِخِلَافِهِ أَيْضًا، قَالَ: إِنَّنَا لَا نَفْهَمُ مِنَ ٱلْعِلْمِ وَٱلْقُدْرَةِ إِلَّا ٱلذَّاتَ ٱلْمُجَرَّدَةَ فَقَطْ، وَهَٰذَا لَمْ يَقُلْهُ ابْنُ حَزْمٍ أَصْلًا، بَلْ قَالَ جَوَابًا عَلَىٰ سُؤَالِ خَصْمِهِ: إِنَّنَا إِذَا أَرَدْنَا ٱلذَّاتَ بِٱلسُّؤَالِ، فَإِنَّ ٱلْعَلِيمَ وَٱلْقَدِيرَ لَا يَدُلَّانِ عَلَىٰ أَحَدٍ إِلَّا ٱللهَ تَعَالَىٰ، وَإِنْ أَرَدْنَا مَا فِيهَا مِنْ مَعْنًى فَيُفْهَمُ مِنَ ٱلْعَلِيمِ أَنَّ لَهُ تَعَالَىٰ مَعْلُومَاتٍ، وَأَنَّهُ لَا يَخْفَىٰ عَلَيْهِ شَيْءٌ، وَنَحْوَ هَٰذَا ٱلْكَلَامِ، فَلَمْ يَقُلْ (ٱلْعِلْمُ وَٱلْقُدْرَةُ) بَلْ قَالَ: «ٱلْعَلِيمُ وَٱلْقَدِيرُ»، وَهَٰذَا كَانَ جَوَابَ خُصُومِهِ ٱلْمُبْطِلِينَ أَصْحَابِ جَهْمٍ مِنَ ٱلْمُعْتَزِلَةِ وَأَضْرَابِهِمْ، فَنَقَلَهُ ابْنُ عَبْدِ ٱلْهَادِيّ وَلَيْتَهُ نَقَلَهُ بِشَكْلِهِ ٱلصَّحِيحِ.

Tell me about your Lord!
Are *knowledge* and *power* the same meaning according to Ibn Ḥazm, or are they different?
Is the meaning of *knowledge* here the same as the meaning of *power* and *ability*?
Or does each one have its own specific meaning?

The question is: Does Ibn Ḥazm consider *knowledge* to be *power*? And does he consider *power* to be *knowledge*? Are they one and the same?

After this quotation from the book *al-Muḥallā*, the difficulty is resolved, praise be to Allah. What I have quoted from *al-Muḥallā* is also found in the book *al-Faṣl*. It affirms for Allah the *power*, *strength*, and *knowledge*, and it explains them clearly without ambiguity or difficulty.

So we find that Ibn ʿAbd al-Hādī spoke words that Ibn Ḥazm never said, and he also said the opposite. He claimed: "We only understand *knowledge* and *power* as the pure Essence (al-dhāt al-mujarradah), and this is something Ibn Ḥazm never said."

Rather, Ibn Ḥazm replied to a question from his opponent, saying: "When we mean the Essence by the question, then *al-ʿAlīm* (The All-Knowing) and *al-Qadīr* (The All-Powerful) only indicate Allah, Exalted is He. And if we mean what is contained in these names in terms of meaning, it is understood from *al-ʿAlīm* that He has knowledge and that nothing is hidden from Him, and similar expressions."

He did **not** say that *knowledge* and *power* are one and the same; rather, he said *al-ʿAlīm* and *al-Qadīr*. This was a response to his opponents among the Jahmites and their followers from the Muʿtazilah, who denied these attributes.

Ibn ʿAbd al-Hādī reported this, but it would have been better if he had reported it correctly.

الفَصْلُ الرَّابِعُ

قَالَ مُحَمَّدٌ إِبْرَاهِيمُ ٱلرَّيْحَانُ الظَّاهِرِيُّ :

نُثْبِتُ مَا أَثْبَتَهُ ٱللهُ تَعَالَىٰ، وَنَنْفِي مَا نَفَاهُ ٱللهُ تَعَالَىٰ، وَلَا نُقَارِنُ رَبَّنَا عَلَىٰ مَا نَجِدُهُ فِي ٱلْمَخْلُوقَاتِ؟! ٱللهُ تَعَالَىٰ يَسْمَعُ، وَيُبْصِرُ، وَيَنْزِلُ، وَلَهُ قُدْرَةٌ وَعِزَّةٌ، وَغَيْرُ ذَٰلِكَ مِمَّا ثَبَتَ بِالنَّصِّ ٱلصَّحِيحِ، وَلَا نَقُولُ: يَسْمَعُ بِصِفَةٍ، وَيُبْصِرُ بِصِفَةٍ؛ لِأَنَّ ٱللهُ تَعَالَىٰ لَمْ يَقُلْهُ. وَهٰذَا قَوْلُ ٱلشَّافِعِيِّ وَٱلْكِنَانِيِّ وَدَاوُودَ وَابْنِ حَزْمٍ، وَقَدْ نَقَلَهُ ٱبْنُ حَزْمٍ عَنْهُمْ، وَذَكَرَ ٱلْكِنَانِيُّ فِي كِتَابِهِ «ٱلْحِيدَةِ» هٰذَا ٱلْمَذْهَبَ وَأَيَّدَهُ وَقَالَ بِهِ فِي مُنَاظَرَتِهِ. فَزَادَ ٱلْمُتَأَخِّرُ فَقَالَ: ٱللهُ تَعَالَىٰ يَسْمَعُ بِصِفَةِ ٱلسَّمْعِ.

فَقَالَ لَهُمْ مُخَالِفُهُمْ: مِنْ أَيْنَ أَتَىٰ قَوْلُكُمْ: «بِصِفَةِ ٱلسَّمْعِ»؟ لِأَنَّ ٱللهُ تَعَالَىٰ لَمْ يَقُلْ هٰذِهِ ٱلْجُمْلَةَ أَصْلًا، فَالْوَاجِبُ أَنْ نَقُولَ بِمَا قَالَ فَقَطْ، وَأَنْ لَا نَزِيدَ مِنْ عِندِ أَنفُسِنَا مَا لَمْ يَقُلْهُ. وَلَا نَقُولُ كَمَا قَالَ بَعْضٌ: كُلُّ شَيْءٍ ذَاتٌ وَصِفَةٌ، وَٱللهُ تَعَالَىٰ شَيْءٌ، فَهُوَ: ذَاتٌ وَصِفَةٌ، وَرَفَعَ عُلْبَةَ ٱلْمُنَادِيلِ وَقَالَ: هٰذِهِ ذَاتٌ وَصِفَةٌ! تَعَالَىٰ ٱللهُ عَمَّا يَقُولُونَ، فَإِنْ كَانَ كُلُّ شَيْءٍ مِنْ ذَاتٍ وَصِفَةٍ، وَٱلشَّيْءُ عِندَهُمْ وَعِندَنَا: إِمَّا أَنْ يَكُونَ هُوَ ٱلْخَٰلِقُ، وَإِمَّا أَنْ يَكُونَ هُوَ ٱلْمَخْلُوقُ. وَٱلْمَخْلُوقُ عِندَ ٱلْجَمِيعِ: هُمْ ٱلْبَشَرُ وَغَيْرُهُمْ. وَٱلْخَٰلِقُ

Chapter Four

Muhammad Ibrahim al-Rayhan al-Zahiri said:

We affirm what Allah, the Exalted, has affirmed, and negate what Allah, the Exalted, has negated. We do not liken our Lord to what you find in creation! Allah, the Exalted, hears, sees, and descends, and He has power and might, and other attributes that have been firmly established by sound texts. **But we do not say: He hears with a "attribute," or He sees with a "attribute," because Allah, the Exalted, did not say this.**

This is the view of al-Shafi'i, al-Kinani, Dawud, and Ibn Hazm, and Ibn Hazm transmitted it from them. Al-Kinani mentioned this doctrine in his book *Al-Haydah* and supported it and said it in his debates. Then a later scholar added: **"Allah, the Exalted, hears by the attribute of hearing."**

Their opponent said to them:
"Where did you get this phrase, 'by the attribute of hearing' from? For Allah, the Exalted, never said this phrase at all. So it is necessary that we say only what He said and do not add from ourselves anything He did not say, and we do not say, as some have said: Everything is essence and attribute; and Allah, the Exalted, is a thing, so He is essence and attribute."

He raised a handkerchief and said:
"This is essence and attribute. Exalted is Allah above what they say! If everything is essence and attribute, and the thing, according to them and us, is either the Creator or the created, and the created for all are humans and others..."

عِندَ ٱلْجَمِيعِ: هُوَ ٱللَّهُ تَعَالَىٰ. فَقَدْ نَصَّ تَعَالَىٰ عَلَىٰ بُطْلَانِ مَا ظَنَّهُ هَٰذَا ٱلْقَائِلُ، فَقَالَ: ﴿لَيْسَ كَمِثْلِهِ شَيْءٌ﴾.

إِذًا: قِيَاسُهُمْ رَبَّهُمْ عَلَىٰ ٱلْمَخْلُوقَاتِ لِأَنَّهُ شَيْءٌ، وَقَوْلُهُمْ بِأَنَّ ٱلشَّيْءِ كَمَا يَرَوْنَ بِالْحَسِّ مُرَكَّبٌ مِنْ ذَاتٍ وَصِفَةٍ، فَٱللَّهُ تَعَالَىٰ ذَاتٌ وَصِفَةٌ: قَوْلٌ بَاطِلٌ مُخَالِفٌ لِلنَّصِّ.

وَقَالَ بَعْضُهُمْ: يَلْزَمُ بِالْعَقْلِ مِنْ قَوْلِنَا: «ٱلسَّمِيعُ» وُجُودُ صِفَةِ ٱلسَّمْعِ

فَقُلتُ لَهُ: ٱلَّذِي يَلْزَمُ بِالْعَقْلِ مِنْ هَٰذِهِ ٱلْجُمَلَةِ: مَعْنَىٰ ٱلسَّمْعِ فَقَطْ، وَلَٰكِنْ لَمَّا كَانَ ٱلْكَلَامُ عَنْ ٱلْمَخْلُوقِ قُلْنَا: صِفَةُ ٱلسَّمْعِ؛ لِأَنَّ ٱلْمَعْنَىٰ مِنَ ٱلْإِسْمِ بِالنِّسْبَةِ لِلْمَخْلُوقِ هُوَ صِفَةٌ فِيهِ مُرَكَّبَةٌ فِي ذَاتِهِ، وَلَٰكِنْ لَمَّا صَحَّ بِالنَّصِّ أَنَّ ٱللَّهَ تَعَالَىٰ لَيْسَ كَمِثْلِهِ شَيْءٌ: بَطَلَ ٱلْقَوْلُ: إِنَّ ٱللَّازِمَ بِالْعَقْلِ مِنْ أَسْمَائِهِ كَمَا نَقُولُ بِالنِّسْبَةِ إِلَىٰ ٱلْمَخْلُوقِينَ، وَصَحَّ أَنَّ ٱللَّازِمَ بِالْعَقْلِ إِثْبَاتُ مَعْنَىٰ ٱلْإِسْمِ ٱلَّذِي سَمَّىٰ ٱللَّهُ تَعَالَىٰ بِهِ نَفْسَهُ.

فَنَقُولُ مَا قَالَ ٱللَّهُ تَعَالَىٰ، فَهُوَ تَعَالَىٰ يَسْمَعُ وَيُبْصِرُ، وَأَنَّ ٱلسَّمِيعَ غَيْرُ ٱلْبَصِيرِ، وَغَيْرُ ٱلْقَدِيرِ وَغَيْرُ ٱلْحَكِيمِ وَغَيْرُ ٱلْعَزِيزِ وَغَيْرُ ٱلْغَفُورِ.

وَلَفْظَةُ (غَيْرُ) هُنَا يُرَادُ بِهَا: أَنَّهَا مُخَالِفَةٌ لَهَا فِي ٱلْمَعْنَىٰ.

أَمَّا دَلَالَةُ هَٰذِهِ ٱلْأَسْمَاءِ عَلَىٰ مُعَيَّنٍ: فَإِنَّهَا تَدُلُّ عَلَىٰ ٱللَّهِ تَعَالَىٰ، فَٱلْمُسَمَّىٰ وَاحِدٌ، وَٱلْأَسْمَاءُ مُخْتَلِفَةٌ مِنْ جِهَةِ ٱلْحُرُوفِ ٱلْمُرَكَّبَةِ، وَمِنْ جِهَةِ ٱلْمَعَانِي ٱلدَّالَّةِ، فَأَسْمَاءُ ٱللَّهُ تَعَالَىٰ حَقٌّ، وَمَعَانِيهَا حَقٌّ، وَهَٰذَا مَا قَالَهُ أَبُو مُحَمَّدٍ رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ.

فَلَوْ قَالُواْ: (مَعَانِي أَسْمَاءِ ٱللَّهُ) بَدَلَ كَلِمَةِ (صِفَاتِ ٱللَّهُ) لَمَا خَالَفُواْ ٱلنَّصَّ.

وَكَذَٰلِكَ: فَقَدْ نَقَلُواْ عَنْ ٱبْنِ حَزْمٍ مَا لَا يَصِحُّ عَنْهُ، فَزَعَمَ بَعْضُهُمْ أَنَّهُ يَقُولُ: إِنَّ أَسْمَاءَ ٱللَّهُ تَعَالَىٰ كُلَّهَا بِمَعْنَىٰ وَاحِدٍ، فَلَا فَرْقَ بَيْنَ قَدِيرٍ وَسَمِيعٍ وَبَصِيرٍ وَعَلِيمٍ وَغَفُورٍ وَعَزِيزٍ!

وَهَٰذَا بَاطِلٌ عَلَىٰ هَٰذَا ٱلْمَعْنَىٰ ٱلَّذِي ذَكَرُوهُ، وَإِنَّمَا قَالَ أَبُو مُحَمَّدٍ ٱبْنُ حَزْمٍ: لَا فَرْقَ بَيْنَ هَٰذِهِ ٱلْأَسْمَاءِ إِنْ كُنتُمْ تَعْنُونَ بِهَا ٱلْمُسَمَّىٰ، فَهِيَ لَا تَدُلُّ إِلَّا عَلَىٰ ٱللَّهُ تَعَالَىٰ، وَلَا تَرْجِعُ إِلَّا إِلَيْهِ.

For everyone: It is Allah, the Exalted. Allah, the Exalted, has explicitly negated what this speaker assumed, saying: *“There is nothing like unto Him”* (Qur’an 42:11).

Therefore, their analogy of their Lord to creatures is false because He is a “thing,” and their basis that a “thing” is, as they see it through perception, composed of essence and attribute, so Allah, the Exalted, is essence and attribute — this is a false statement contradicting the text.

Some of them say that reason necessitates from our saying "The All-Hearing" the existence of the attribute of hearing.

I said to him:
What reason necessitates from this phrase is the meaning of hearing only. But since the discussion is about created things, we say “attribute of hearing,” because the meaning of the noun in relation to created things is an attribute in it, combined in its essence. But since it is established by text that Allah, the Exalted, is not like anything (ليس كمثله شيء), the statement that reason necessitates that the names refer to attributes as they do in created things is invalid.

It is correct that reason necessitates affirming the meaning of the name that Allah, the Exalted, named Himself with.

Therefore, we say what Allah, the Exalted, said: He, the Exalted, hears and sees, and that The Hearing is not The Seeing, nor The Powerful, nor The Wise, nor The Mighty, nor The Forgiving.

The word *“غير”* (ghayr - “other than”) here means it is different from or opposite in meaning.

As for the indication of these names on a particular entity: they indicate Allah, the Exalted, because the named entity is one, and the names differ in their composed letters and their indicative meanings.

The names of Allah, the Exalted, are true, and their meanings are true, and this is what Abu Muhammad (Ibn Hazm), may Allah have mercy on him, said.

If they said: “Meanings of the names of Allah” instead of the phrase “attributes of Allah,” they would not contradict the text.

Likewise, they have attributed to Ibn Hazm things that are not authentically from him. Some of them claimed that he said:
“All the names of Allah, the Exalted, have one meaning, so there is no difference between The Powerful, The Hearing, The Seeing, The Knowing, The Forgiving, and The Mighty!”

This is false according to the meaning they mentioned.

Rather, Abu Muhammad Ibn Hazm said:
“There is no difference between these names if you mean by them the named entity — they indicate only Allah, the Exalted, and refer only to Him.”

فَأَيْنَ مَا قَالَهُ مِمَّا نَسَبُوهُ إِلَيْهِ! وَكَيْفَ يَصِحُّ هٰذَا ٱلنَّقْلُ عَنْهُ وَهُوَ يَقُولُ بِأَنَّ ٱلْإِجْمَاعَ قَدْ قَامَ عَلَىٰ جَوَازِ دُعَاءِ ٱللهِ بِمَعَانِي أَسْمَائِهِ؟؟! وَذَكَرَ وُجُوهَ هٰذِهِ ٱلْمَعَانِي وَذَكَرَ فِي هٰذِهِ ٱلدُّعَاءَاتِ مَا هُوَ تَفْسِيرٌ لِأَسْمَاءِ ٱللهِ تَعَالَىٰ، وَهٰذَا كُلُّهُ مَسْطُورٌ فِي كِتَابِهِ «ٱلْفِصْلِ».

فَإِنْ أَثْبَتَ ٱبْنُ حَزْمٍ أَسْمَاءَ ٱللهِ تَعَالَىٰ، وَأَثْبَتَ مَعَانِيهَا: فَهُوَ قَائِلٌ بِالْحَقِّ، وَمُخَالِفٌ لِلْجَهْمِيَّةِ وَغَيْرِهِمْ، فَلَا تَصِحُّ نِسْبَتُهُ إِلَىٰ ٱلْجَهْمِيَّةِ أَصْلًا لَا فِي إِبْطَالِ ٱلْأَسْمَاءِ، وَلَا فِي إِبْطَالِ مَعَانِي ٱلْأَسْمَاءِ أَبَدًا، وَمَن نَسَبَهُ إِلَيْهِمْ فَهُوَ إِمَّا نَاقِلٌ بِغَيْرِ عِلْمٍ، وَإِمَّا قَارِئٌ بِغَيْرِ فَهْمٍ، رَغْمَ أَنَّ نُصُوصَ ٱبْنِ حَزْمٍ صَرِيحَةٌ وَوَاضِحَةٌ، وَٱلْعِبْرَةُ بِجَمْعِ هٰذِهِ ٱلنُّصُوصِ كُلِّهَا وَٱسْتِخْرَاجِ ٱلنَّتَائِجِ، لَا ٱلْأَخْذِ بِجُزْءٍ مِنَ ٱلْكَلَامِ فِي مَوْضِعٍ مِنَ ٱلْمَوَاضِعِ وَٱلِاكْتِفَاءِ بِهِ، فَكَيْفَ نَفْهَمُ قَوْلَ ٱلْعَالِمِ بِغَيْرِ جَمْعِ أَقْوَالِهِ!!

لٰكِنْ لَمَّا ٱبْتَدَعُواْ كَلِمَةَ (صِفَاتِ ٱللهِ) وَوَجَدُواْ ٱبْنَ حَزْمٍ يُبْطِلُ هٰذِهِ ٱلْكَلِمَةَ، وَلَمْ يَقِفُواْ عَلَىٰ قَوْلِهِ فِي إِثْبَاتِ مَعَانِي أَسْمَاءِ ٱللهِ تَعَالَىٰ، أَوْ وَقَفُواْ عَلَيْهِ وَلٰكِنْ لَمْ يَفْهَمُواْ مَرَادَهُ مِنْهُ، قَالُواْ: أَبْطَلَ ٱبْنَ حَزْمٍ صِفَاتِ ٱللهِ، فَأَسْمَاءُ ٱللهِ تَعَالَىٰ لَا مَعْنَىٰ لَهُ عِندَهُ، وَأَنَّهَا عَدَمٌ فِي ٱلْحَقِيقَةِ!

فَٱلْعَتَبُ عَلَىٰ مَنْ لَمْ يَفْهَمْ كَلَامَ أَبِي مُحَمَّدٍ، أَوْ لَمْ يَقِفُواْ عَلَىٰ جَمِيعِ قَوْلِهِ، فَخِلَافُهُ مَعَ ٱبْنِ تَيْمِيَّةَ وَٱبْنِ عَقِيلٍ ٱلظَّاهِرِيِّ يَتَحَقَّقُ فِي إِثْبَاتِهِمْ كَلِمَةَ (صِفَةِ ٱللهِ) فَٱبْنُ حَزْمٍ يُبْطِلُهَا، وَهُمْ يُثْبِتُونَهَا.

وَهُمْ فِي ٱلْحَقِيقَةِ يَتَّفِقُونَ عَلَىٰ أَنَّ أَسْمَاءَ ٱللهِ تَعَالَىٰ حَقٌّ، وَأَنَّهَا تَقْتَضِي إِثْبَاتَ مَعَانِيهَا، فَهٰذِهِ هِيَ حَقِيقَةُ ٱلِاخْتِلَافِ بَيْنَهُمْ، وَبِسَبَبِهَا ذَمَّنِي مَنْ لَمْ يَفْهَمْ كَلَامَ أَبِي مُحَمَّدٍ وَلَا كَلَامَ ٱبْنِ تَيْمِيَّةَ وَٱبْنِ عَقِيلٍ!

فَهٰذَا مَا قُلْتُهُ وَوَافَقْتُ فِيهِ ٱبْنَ حَزْمٍ وَخَالَفْتُ فِيهِ ٱبْنَ تَيْمِيَّةَ وَٱبْنَ عَقِيلٍ ٱلظَّاهِرِيِّ وَكُلَّ مَنْ قَالَ بِقَوْلِهِمْ مِنْ قَدِيمٍ أَوْ مُعَاصِرٍ، وَوَضَّحْتُ ذٰلِكَ فِي مَقَالاتٍ كَثِيرَةٍ، وَلٰكِنَّ بَعْضَ مَنْ يَدَّعِي ٱلْعَمَلَ بِٱلظَّاهِرِ لَا يَقْرَأُ، أَوْ لَا يُرِيدُ أَنْ يَقْرَأَ!

فَلَمْ يُكَلِّفْ أَحَدُهُمْ نَفْسَهُ إِظْهَارَ ٱلدَّلِيلِ ٱلَّذِي غَابَ، فَوَجَدُواْ أَسْهَلَ طَرِيقٍ لِإِسْكَاتِ مَنْ يَقُولُ بِمَا قُلْتُهُ هُوَ: ٱلتَّهْوِيلُ وَٱلطَّعْنُ وَٱلذَّمُّ.

فَلَمَّا ٱسْتَمَرَّ أَكْثَرُ ٱلظَّاهِرِيَّةِ عَلَىٰ مَا ذَكَرْتُ وَذَكَرَ ٱبْنُ حَزْمٍ قَبْلِي: ظَهَرَ لَهُمْ سُوءَ عَمَلِهِمْ فَخَابُواْ وَخَسِرُواْ، فَلَمْ يَرْجِعُواْ إِلَّا بِإِثْمِ ٱلطَّعْنِ بِغَيْرِ مُوجِبٍ، وَٱلتَّقْلِيدِ لِقَوْلِ ٱلْعُلَمَاءِ.

So where is what he said from what they attributed to him?! And how can this transmission from him be correct when he states that consensus has been established on the permissibility of supplicating to Allah with the meanings of His names?! He mentioned the aspects of these meanings and included in these supplications what serves as an interpretation of Allah's exalted names—all of which is recorded in his book *Al-Fasl*.

If Ibn Hazm affirms the names of Allah the Exalted and affirms their meanings, then he is speaking the truth and opposing the Jahmiyya and others. Thus, it is entirely incorrect to attribute him to the Jahmiyya—neither in negating the names nor in negating the meanings of the names, ever. Whoever ascribes him to them is either transmitting without knowledge or reciting without understanding, despite the fact that Ibn Hazm's texts are explicit and clear. The lesson lies in compiling all these texts and deriving conclusions, not in taking a fragment of speech from one place and being content with it. How can we understand a scholar's statement without compiling all his sayings?!

However, when they innovated the term *"attributes of Allah"* and found Ibn Hazm rejecting this term—without considering his statements affirming the meanings of Allah's exalted names, or perhaps they did but failed to grasp his intent—they said: *"Ibn Hazm negated Allah's attributes, so the names of Allah the Exalted have no meaning according to him, and they are essentially nonexistent!"*

The blame falls on those who did not understand Abu Muhammad's (Ibn Hazm's) words or did not examine all his statements. His disagreement with Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn ʻAqil al-Dhahiri lies in their affirmation of the term *"attributes of Allah."* Ibn Hazm rejects it, while they affirm it. Yet, in reality, they all agree that Allah's names are true and that they necessitate the affirmation of their meanings. This is the true nature of their disagreement.

Because of this, those who did not understand the words of Abu Muhammad (Ibn Hazm), nor the words of Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn ʻAqil, criticized me. This is what I have stated, in which I agreed with Ibn Hazm and disagreed with Ibn Taymiyya, Ibn ʻAqil, and all those who followed their opinion—past or present. I have clarified this in many articles, but some who claim to adhere to the apparent (texts) do not read—or do not want to read!

Not one of them bothered to present the missing evidence. Instead, they found the easiest way to silence those who say what I have said: intimidation, slander, and bloodshed.

When most of the Dhahiriyya persisted in what I mentioned—and what Ibn Hazm had stated before me—the corruption of their actions became evident to them, so they failed and lost. They did not retreat except by sinfully slandering without justification and blindly following the statements of scholars.

فَأَهْلُ ٱلظَّاهِرِ لَمْ يَتَعَلَّمُواْ ٱلْعِلْمَ لِيُقَلِّدُواْ غَيْرَهُمْ، فَحَقُّ كُلِّ ظَاهِرِيٍّ أَنْ يَقُولَ بِمَا يَتَيَقَّنُ مِنْ صِحَّتِهِ فِي مَسَائِلِ ٱلْعَقِيدَةِ وَٱلْأُصُولِ وَٱلْفِقْهِ، وَوَافَقَهُ مَنْ وَافَقَهُ مِنْهُمْ، وَخَالَفَهُ مَنْ خَالَفَهُ مِنْهُمْ، مَا دَامَ ٱلْأَصْلُ ٱلْأَوَّلُ ٱلَّذِي جَمَعَهُمْ بَاقِيًا كَمَا هُوَ عِندَهُ، وَهُوَ: إِبْطَالُ ٱلظُّنُونِ كَافَّةً، وَٱلِاكْتِفَاءُ بِالْيَقِينِ مِنَ ٱلنَّصِّ وَٱلْعَقْلِ وَٱللُّغَةِ.

وَلِذَٰلِكَ تَرَىٰ لِكُلِّ مُتْقِنٍ مِّنْهُمْ مَذْهَبَهُ ٱلْفِقْهِيَّ ٱلْخَاصَّ بِهِ بِحَسَبِ مَا بَلَغَهُ مِنْ يَقِينٍ؛ لِأَنَّ ٱلْيَقِينَ ٱلَّذِي وَقَفَ عَلَيْهِ هُوَ ٱللاَّزِمُ لَهُ، لَا يَقِينُ غَيْرِهِ مِمَّا لَمْ يَصِحَّ أَنَّهُ يَقِينٌ، أَوْ مِمَّا لَمْ يَقِفْ عَلَيْهِ ٱلْمُخَالِفُ.

وَقَدْ ظَهَرَ عَلَىٰ ٱلشَّبَكَةِ بَعْضُ مَنْ يَدَّعِي ٱلْعَمَلَ بِٱلظَّاهِرِ وَهُوَ يَقُولُ بِوُجُوبِ تَقْلِيدِ ٱلظَّاهِرِيَّةِ، فَمِنْهُمْ مَنْ يُوجِبُ تَقْلِيدَ ٱبْنِ حَزْمٍ وَلَا يَرَىٰ جَوَازَ ٱلْخُرُوجِ عَنْ قَوْلِهِ، وَمِنْهُمْ مَنْ يَرَىٰ وُجُوبَ تَقْلِيدِ ٱبْنِ عَقِيلٍ، وَلَا يُجِيزُ لِأَحَدٍ ٱلْخُرُوجَ عَنْ قَوْلِهِ، وَيَذْهَبُ إِلَىٰ تَخْطِئَةِ كُلِّ قَدِيمٍ أَوْ مُتَأَخِّرٍ خَالَفَ مِمَّنْ أَوْجَبَ هَٰذَا ٱلْمَدَّعِيُّ تَقْلِيدَهُ!

فَهَٰذَا خُرُوجٌ عَنْ ٱلْعَمَلِ بِٱلظَّاهِرِ، وَحَقٌّ عَلَىٰ مَنْ يَرَىٰ تَقْلِيدَ أَحَدٍ مِّنَ ذَكَرْتُ: أَنْ يُسَمَّىٰ بِـ(ٱلْعَقِيلِيِّ) أَوْ (ٱلْحَزْمِيِّ) أَوْ (ٱلدَّاوُودِيِّ) فَلَا مَعْنَىٰ لِٱنتِسَابِهِ فِي أَهْلِ ٱلظَّاهِرِ!

أَمَّا أَهْلُ ٱلْعِلْمِ مِنْ أَهْلِ ٱلظَّاهِرِ: فَإِنَّ ٱلتَّقْلِيدَ عِندَهُمْ حَرَامٌ، سَوَاءٌ كَانَ ٱلتَّقْلِيدُ لِٱبْنِ حَزْمٍ أَوْ لِٱبْنِ عَقِيلٍ، فَكُلُّ ٱلتَّقْلِيدِ مَذْمُومٌ عِندَهُمْ، وَهُوَ مَذْمُومٌ

فَلا يُعْبَأُ أَهْلُ الظَّاهِرِ بِمِثْلِ هَذِهِ الدَّعَوَاتِ الْبَاطِلَةِ، وَلا يُعْبَأُ بِمَنْ يَدَّعِي أَنَّهُمْ مِّنْهُمْ وَهُوَ يَقُولُ بِهَذِهِ الْأَقْوَالِ الْمَذْمُومَةِ، وَلا يُعْبَأُ الْمُحِقُّ مِنْهُمْ بِذَمِّ جَاهِلٍ أَوْ أَحْمَقٍ، فَإِنَّ أَهْلَ الظَّاهِرِ قَدِ اعْتَادُوا عَلَىٰ مِثْلِ هَذِهِ الْجَهَالَةِ وَالذَّمِّ، فَأَنَّ أَهْلَ الرَّأْيِ وَالتَّقْلِيدِ لَمْ يُقَصِّرُوا فِي ذَٰلِكَ، فَمَا أَثَّرَ فِي أَهْلِ الظَّاهِرِ ذَمُّهُمْ أَبَدًا.

وَالظَّاهِرِيُّ الْمُحَقِّقُ هُوَ: مَنْ يَعْرِفُ الْأَدِلَّةَ وَيُصَحِّحُهَا، ثُمَّ يَعْتَقِدُ بِمَا فِيهَا فِي بَابِ الْعَقِيدَةِ وَالْفِقْهِ وَالْأُصُولِ وَغَيْرِ ذَٰلِكَ، فَإِنَّ اعْتَقَدَ مَدْلُولَهَا قَبْلَ تَصْحِيحِهَا: فَلَا فَرْقَ بَيْنَهُ وَبَيْنَ أَهْلِ الْمَذَاهِبِ مِنَ الْمُقَلِّدَةِ، فَهَذَا هُوَ فِعْلُهُمْ نَفْسُهُ.

"The followers of the Ẓāhirī school did not seek knowledge merely to imitate others. Therefore, every true Ẓāhirī has the right to uphold what he is certain of in matters of creed, fundamentals, and jurisprudence—regardless of whether others agree or disagree with him—so long as the foundational principle that unites them remains intact. And that principle is: the rejection of all conjecture, relying solely on certainty from the text, reason, and language.

This is why you will find each independent scholar among them holding his own jurisprudential stance based on what he has reached with certainty. For the certainty he has attained is binding upon him—not the certainty of others, which may not be valid certainty to him, or which the opposing party may not have even encountered. Recently, some have appeared online claiming to follow the Ẓāhirī school while asserting the obligation of blind imitation (taqlīd) of Ẓāhirī scholars. Some insist on imitating Ibn Ḥazm, forbidding any departure from his views, while others demand imitation of Ibn ʿAqīl, not permitting anyone to oppose him—even going so far as to condemn every early or later scholar who disagrees with whomever this claimant has deemed obligatory to follow!

This is a clear departure from the Ẓāhirī methodology. In truth, anyone who advocates imitating any of the figures I mentioned should be called an 'Aqīlī (follower of Ibn ʿAqīl), a Ḥazmī (follower of Ibn Ḥazm), or a Dāwūdī (follower of Dāwūd al-Ẓāhirī)—not a Ẓāhirī! As for the true scholars among the Ẓāhirīs, they consider all forms of blind imitation (taqlīd) forbidden—whether it is imitating Ibn Ḥazm, Ibn ʿAqīl, or anyone else. All imitation is condemned in their view.

Thus, the true Ẓāhirīs pay no heed to these false claims, nor do they care about those who claim to be among them while promoting such blameworthy views. The sincere among them are not troubled by the criticism of the ignorant or the foolish, for the Ẓāhirīs have long grown accustomed to such ignorance and slander. The followers of opinion and blind imitation have never ceased in this regard, yet the Ẓāhirīs have never been harmed by their condemnation.

A true, well-grounded Ẓāhirī is one who knows the evidences, verifies them, and then forms his beliefs accordingly—whether in creed, jurisprudence, fundamentals, or other matters. If he believes in the implications of a text before verifying it, then there is no difference between him and the blind followers of other schools—he is doing exactly what they do."

وَتَجِدُ بَعْضَ مَنْ يَدَّعِي الْعَمَلَ بِالظَّاهِرِ يَقَعُ بِمَا وَقَعَ فِيهِ أَهْلُ التَّقْلِيدِ، فَيَعْتَقِدُ بِحَسَبِ النَّشْأَةِ بَعْضَ الْأَقْوَالِ فِي بَابِ الْعَقِيدَةِ، فَيَصْعُبُ عَلَيْهِ النَّظَرُ خَارِجَ صُنْدُوقِ بِيئَتِهِ، فَيَبْقَى مُدَافِعًا عَنْ هَذَا الْاعْتِقَادِ وَإِنْ كَانَ الدَّلِيلُ الْمُتَيَقَّنُ يُؤَكِّدُ خِلافَ مَا اعْتَقَدَ.

وَهَذَا بَعْضُ أَسْبَابِ اخْتِلَافِي مَعَ بَعْضِ مَنْ يَدَّعِي الْعَمَلَ بِالظَّاهِرِ، فَهَؤُلَاءِ لَوْ أَثْبَتُوا الْأَدِلَّةَ ثُمَّ مَدْلُولَهَا: لَمَا اخْتَلَفْنَا فِي شَيْءٍ، وَلَكُنْتُ الْحَبِيبَ الْمُقَرَّبَ إِلَيْهِمْ، وَلكِنَّ لَمَّا أَثْبَتُوا مَا يَعْتَقِدُونَ قَبْلَ إِثْبَاتِ الْأَدِلَّةِ: كُنْتُ مِنْ جُمْلَةِ الْمَذْمُومِينَ عِندَهُمْ.

فَهَؤُلَاءِ لَا تَصِحُّ ظَاهِرِيَّتُهُمْ أَصْلًا، وَإِنَّمَا فَرُّوا إِلَىٰ الْقَوْلِ بِالظَّاهِرِ لِتَرْكِ الْعَمَلِ بِالْقِيَاسِ فَقَطْ، وَلَمْ يَفْهَمُوا أَنَّ إِبْطَالَ الْقِيَاسِ لَا يَعْنِي أَنَّكَ شَهَادَةٌ بِأَنَّكَ مِنَ الظَّاهِرِيَّةِ.

فَالظَّاهِرُ يَتَعَلَّقُ بِالْعَقِيدَةِ وَالْأُصُولِ وَالْفِقْهِ وَالْحَدِيثِ وَالْأَدَبِ وَالسِّيَاسَةِ وَغَيْرِ ذَٰلِكَ مِنْ أَبْوَابِ الشَّرِيعَةِ، وَيُوَجِّبُ عَلَىٰ أَهْلِهِ تَثْبِيتَ الْأَدِلَّةِ ثُمَّ تَثْبِيتَ مَا دَلَّتْ عَلَيْهِ، وَوَافَقْتِ النَّاسَ وَالْفُقَهَاءَ بِذَٰلِكَ أَوْ خَالَفْتَهُمْ.

وَسَبَبُ هَذَا الاسْتِطْرَادِ: أَنَّ الَّذِينَ يَدَّعُونَ الْعَمَلَ بِالظَّاهِرِ هَذِهِ الْأَيَّامِ كَثْرَةٌ، وَالْكَثِيرُ مِّنْهُمْ مَجْهُولُ الْعَيْنِ لَا يَعْرِفُ أَحَدٌ اسْمَهُ وَلَا حَقِيقَةَ مَا وَرَاءَ هَذِهِ الْكُنيَةِ، فَعَلَىٰ الظَّاهِرِيِّ الْمُبْتَدِئِ وَغَيْرِهِ أَنْ يُمَحِّصَ وَيُمَيِّزَ وَيَعْرِفَ النَّاسَ مِنْ خِلَالِ أَقْوَالِهِمْ، فَمَنْ وَافَقَ الظَّاهِرَ الَّذِي هُوَ الِاكْتِفَاءُ بِالْقَطْعِيَّاتِ مِنَ النُّصُوصِ

وَالْعَقْلِ وَاللُّغَةِ، وَإِبْطَالِ الظُّنُونِ وَغَلَبَتِهِ فِي النُّصُوصِ وَالْعَقْلِ وَاللُّغَةِ: كَانَ ظَاهِرِيًّا، وَمَنْ خَالفَ ذَٰلِكَ: فَلَا يَكُونُ مِنهُمْ أَبَدًا.

فَهَذَا هُوَ الْمِيزَانُ، وَلَيْسَ الْمِيزَانُ عِندَ أَهْلِ الظَّاهِرِ: مَدَىٰ مَوَافَقَةِ الْقَائِلِ لِقَوْلِ دَاوُدٍ أَوِ ابْنِ حَزْمٍ أَوِ ابْنِ عَقِيلٍ أَوْ غَيْرِهِمْ مِنْ أَهْلِ الظَّاهِرِ، فَهَذَا مِيزَانٌ بَاطِلٌ لَا جَائِزٌ وَزْنُ الْأَشْيَاءِ بِهِ.

وَسَيَبْقَىٰ الْعَمَلُ بِالظَّاهِرِ ظَاهِرًا عَلَىٰ كُلِّ ظَنٍّ وَبَاطِلٍ، وَسَيَبْقَىٰ كَذَٰلِكَ إِلَىٰ قِيَامِ السَّاعَةِ بِإِذْنِ اللهِ تَعَالَىٰ، فَلَا يَضُرُّهُ تَخَاذُلٌ وَلَا ذَمٌّ وَلَا جَهَالَةٌ.

أَسْأَلُ اللهَ أَنْ يُثَبِّتَنَا عَلَىٰ يَقِينِ النَّصِّ حَتَّىٰ نَلْقَاهُ، آمِينَ

"Some of those who claim to follow the Ẓāhirī (literalist) approach fall into the same trap as blind followers (ahl al-taqlīd). They adopt certain creedal beliefs based on their upbringing, making it difficult for them to think outside the framework of their environment. Thus, they stubbornly defend these beliefs even when definitive evidence contradicts them.

This is partly why I differ with some who claim adherence to the Ẓāhirī school. Had they first established the evidence and then derived their conclusions from it, we would not have disagreed on anything—and I would have been their beloved companion. But since they affirmed their beliefs before verifying the evidence, I became one of the condemned in their eyes.

Such individuals are not true Ẓāhirīs at all. They merely adopted the Ẓāhirī label to avoid using analogical reasoning (qiyās), without realizing that rejecting qiyās alone does not make one a Ẓāhirī. The Ẓāhirī methodology encompasses creed, legal principles, jurisprudence, hadith, literature, politics, and other aspects of Sharia. It requires its adherents to first establish the evidence and then affirm what it proves—whether it aligns with or contradicts the views of scholars and jurists.

The reason for this digression is that many today falsely claim to follow the Ẓāhirī approach, yet most are obscure figures—unknown in name or true identity behind their pseudonyms. Therefore, a beginner or anyone else in the Ẓāhirī school must scrutinize and distinguish, recognizing people by their statements. Whoever adheres to the Ẓāhirī principle—relying solely on definitive proofs from texts, reason, and language while rejecting conjecture—is truly a Ẓāhirī. Whoever opposes this can never be counted among them.

This is the true criterion. For the Ẓāhirīs, the standard is not whether someone agrees with Dāwūd (al-Ẓāhirī), Ibn Ḥazm, Ibn ʿAqīl, or any other Ẓāhirī scholar. Such a measure is invalid and illegitimate for weighing truth.

The Ẓāhirī methodology will remain manifest, overcoming every falsehood and distortion, and it will endure—by Allah’s will—until the Day of Judgment. Neither deception, slander, nor ignorance can harm it.

I ask Allah to keep us steadfast upon the certainty of the text until we meet Him. Āmīn."